## Exhibit B

	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	Case No. 22-10943-mew
4	x
5	In the Matter of:
6	
7	VOYAGER DIGITAL HOLDINGS,
8	
9	Debtor.
10	x
11	United States Bankruptcy Court
12	One Bowling Green
13	New York, NY 10004
14	
15	March 7, 2023
16	2:10 PM
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	BEFORE:
22	HON MICHAEL E. WILES
23	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
24	
25	ECRO: F. FERGUSON

```
Page 2
 1
     HEARING re Court reading decision into the record.
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
     Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde
```

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	LATHAM & WATKINS
4	Attorneys for Binance.US
5	1271 Avenue of the Americas
6	New York, NY 10020
7	
8	BY: ADAM J. GOLDBERG
9	
10	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART SULLIVAN HEARING OFFICER PARIS
11	Attorneys for Special Committee
12	51 Madison Avenue
13	New York, NY 10010
14	
15	BY: SUSHEEL KIRPALANI
16	
17	KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
18	Attorneys for the Debtors
19	601 Lexington Avenue
20	New York, NY 10022
21	
22	BY: CHRISTINE OKIKE
23	MIKE SLADE
24	
25	

		Page 4
1	UNIT	ED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
2		Attorneys for the U.S. Trustee
3		Alexander Hamilton Custom House
4		New York, NY 10004
5		
6	BY:	PETER M. ARONOFF
7		RICHARD C. MORRISSEY
8		
9	SECU	RITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
10		Attorneys for the Securities and Exchange Commission
11		100 F Street, NE
12		Washington, DC 20549
13		
14	BY:	THERESE SCHEUER
15		
16	NATI	ONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL
17		Attorneys for States
18		1850 M St NW, 12th Floor
19		Washington, DC, 20036
20		
21	BY:	KAREN CORDRY
22		
23		
24		
25		

		Page 5
1	UNIT	ED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
2		Attorneys for United States of America
3		86 Chambers Street, 3rd Floor
4		New York, NY 10007
5		
6	BY:	JEAN-DAVID BARNEA
7		
8	MCDE	RMOTT, WILL & EMERY
9		Attorneys for Special Committee
10		One Vanderbilt Avenue
11		New York, NY 10017
12		
13	BY:	DARREN AZMAN
14		
15	KILP.	ATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
16		Attorneys for Ad Hoc Group of Equity Interest Holders
17		1114 Avenue of the Americas
18		New York, NY 10036
19		
20	BY:	KELLY MOYNIHAN
21		
22	TRAC	Y HENDERSHOTT
23		Pro Se Creditor
24		
25		

```
Page 6
 1
     JOHN LOREN
 2
           Pro Se Creditor
 3
 4
     GINA DIRESTA
 5
           Pro Se Creditor
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Page 7 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: All right. We're here for the 3 resumption and hopefully completion of our confirmation hearing in the Voyager case. There were a few open issues. 4 5 Number one, I see that the names of the independent 6 directors have been filed and disclosed. 7 MS. OKIKE: Correct, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Is the representative of the Ad Hoc 9 Equity Committee on the phone? 10 MS. MOYNIHAN: Yes, Your Honor. Kelly Moynihan 11 from Patrick Townsend. 12 THE COURT: Are you pleased with the selection? 13 Do you have any further objection to the people who've been 14 selected and named? 15 MS. MOYNIHAN: No, Your Honor. No further 16 objection. Thank you. 17 THE COURT: Very good. We had also left open a 18 question of just how we were going to treat customer data 19 and the transfers of data, particularly for customers who 20 hadn't yet and may not ever become finance customers. Have 21 we reached any agreements or resolutions of that point? 22 MS. OKIKE: Yes, Your Honor. Christine Okike of 23 Kirkland and Ellis on behalf of the Debtors. I will read 24 into the record the proposed resolution. So there will be a 25 two-week period for customers to opt out of transferring

	Page 8
1	selfies uploaded, identifications, or bank statements, and
2	bank account information. Any opted-out information would
3	not be acquired by the purchaser in the transaction, and
4	that notice will be provided by the Debtors at the Debtors'
5	expense. The expense reimbursement start date for the
6	Debtors, which was to begin on March 18, 2000
7	THE COURT: Wait a minute. Selfies? I couldn't
8	write fast enough.
9	MS. OKIKE: Selfies, uploaded IDs. So driver's
10	licenses, passports, other forms of identification.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	MS. OKIKE: Bank statements, and bank account
13	information.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MS. OKIKE: The expense reimbursement provision
16	for the Debtor
17	THE COURT: Social Security numbers?
18	MAN 1: Your Honor, that would be required
19	(indiscernible).
20	THE COURT: Why? Just help me.
21	MAN 1: That is, along with names and addresses,
22	an important part of identifying and establishing the basis
23	for new customer chats should anyone elect to join the
24	platform in the future.
25	THE COURT: But I cannot imagine a piece of

Page 9 1 information more quickly and easily given to you if a 2 customer wants to do that than their Social Security number. 3 Why you need that in advance I'm having trouble understanding. 4 5 MAN 1: There's a couple of reasons, Your Honor. 6 You know, I think -- and really this, if I may explain all 7 of these issues? 8 THE COURT: Yeah. 9 MAN 1: I think there's -- the customer data, just 10 to set the context, Your Honor, is really at the heart of 11 the transaction for Binance.US. When we agreed to pay the 12 \$20 million purchase price, we didn't know how many 13 customers would agree to join the Binance. US platform. so the value of each individual customer's future actions on 14 15 the platform are as unknown. The only known commodity that 16 Voyager has to sell is the data, and that was at the heart 17 of the deal. So the information has, I think, three main value 18 19 sources to Binance.US as a technology company that 20 fundamentally depends upon data. One is the ability to 21 simply reach out to a customer and market to them. Second, 22 the information is valuable because whenever a customer onboards to the Binance.US platform -- and they may not do 23 24 that today. They may do that well down the road.

cryptocurrency markets are extremely volatile, as we all

know. There's bear markets like we're in now, and there's bull markets. And when there's a bull market, many people join the platform that may not have had any intention to do so in the bear market.

Having the KYC information mitigates the actual monetary cost that Binance.US would have to pay affirmatively to conduct the KYC each time someone joins. And so having the Social Security number and other information that is not part of this excluded information that Ms. Okike mentioned would be valuable to avoid that actual cash expense to Binance.US.

Third, as a technology company that uses data to enable and empower its operations, even if someone doesn't join the platform, the data that Voyager has about their past activities is very valuable in enabling Binance.US to market and conduct and enhance its operations going forward. So that is the source of the value for the transaction --

THE COURT: What does somebody's Social Security number have to do with that third point you just mentioned?

MAN 1: Well, it enables part of the modern marketing process, right? That -- as Your Honor knows, right, we've received tons of emails, tons of direct mail. That's -- we throw it all out. We delete it. But when there's more targeted marketing that can go someone based on knowledge of their circumstances and past transaction

Page 11 1 history, that maximizes the ability to get someone in the 2 door for a retail operation. 3 THE COURT: If somebody has already opted out of 4 selfies, uploaded IDs, bank statements, and bank account, 5 you would need that information if they later wanted to open 6 an account, right? 7 MAN 1: Not necessarily, Your Honor. The first level of KYC that applies to most customers does not require 8 9 that information. 10 THE COURT: You don't require that information 11 yourself before the account can actually be up and 12 functioning? 13 MAN 1: My understanding is that not all of that 14 information is required in all cases. The --15 THE COURT: And why is -- you know, if Voyager 16 sent other information to you, why does the absence of a 17 Social Security number disable the -- you know, your 18 customer data in the way you've kind of suggested to me? I 19 don't understand that. 20 MAN 1: Well, my understanding is that when a new 21 customer joins, they would be providing their Social 22 Security number at that time. And then Binance.US has to 23 pay a third party provider to conduct the KYC in order to 24 run the check on that person. 25 THE COURT: Okay, but -- so -- but you seem to

have suggested that the KYC information that you've gotten from the Debtors would somehow not be very good without the Social Security number. Or are you saying you're actually going to do -- use the Social Security numbers in advance to do KYC checks on everybody who might in the future become a customer?

MAN 1: Your Honor, my understanding from discussions with my client, and obviously there's a number of technical details here, is that, you know, Voyager's already done KYC checks on all of their customers of course, right? And so part of this transaction is to acquire that information and have the KYC platform for all of these customers in place, and that's a very valuable part of the transaction alone.

is, Voyager gives it to you. Can it be given to you without the Social Security number? Because it seems to me if somebody wants to be a customer -- if somebody elects not to let you have the Social Security number and then changes their mind, all you do is plug that into what you have. Or if, as you say, you want to go out and hire somebody to do an additional check, you would have -- you're certainly not going to be put at any great delay because somebody can give you the Social Security number in an instant.

MAN 1: Well, Your Honor, if I may actually

Page 13 1 express my personal experience, about a year ago when crypto 2 markets were pretty hot before all of this, I actually tried 3 to open an account. And I started doing it, and then I got 4 busy and gave up because it took time and effort to go And I think part of the benefit of having this 5 6 information in place at Binance. US is that it allows 7 instantaneous KYC checks that have already been, you know, 8 pre-done by Voyager and can be relied upon to some extent as 9 well as avoiding the cost of a third-party service. And so 10 11 THE COURT: But what I'm not understanding and 12 you're not helping me with is you can have everything all 13 set up, customer name, address, all that information that 14 Voyager gives you. But the only thing if somebody elects 15 within your two-week period not to let you have the Social 16 Security number, all they would have to do is plug that 17 remaining bit of information into the stuff that you have. 18 I absolutely fail to understand why you need that 19 information in advance. 20 MAN 1: Well --21 THE COURT: It's information that a lot of people

regard as very sensitive.

MAN 1: The -- that -- in completing the KYC check would come at cash expense to Binance. US. In addition, the delay that it takes and requirement for someone to go ahead

22

23

24

and enter their Social Security number and then run that check, even if it's done relatively quickly, that delay, that extra step could leave to slippage and breakage in a colloquial sense and lose a customer.

THE COURT: Let me try it this way. If somebody has not given you this other information and you have their Social Security number, then they decide they want to be a customer, and they tell you that, do you have an additional know-your-customer check that you have to do at that time?

MAN 1: My understanding is that if we acquired all of the information with the exclusion of the information we've agreed to leave behind, we would have the KYC information in place for Voyager customers.

THE COURT: So you'd have it in place. So if you get all of that same information except for the Social Security number, and then somebody wants to be a customer, why do you have to do anything other than plug in the Social Security number? You keep telling me you have to do a new know-your-customer check. I don't understand that. If you have all the other information just not the Social Security number, what's the big deal?

MAN 1: I don't know if that would require a new expense. It would certainly involve requiring additional information from the customer, an additional step in the process, and that could lose customers. And that's part of

the value for the Binance of the ease of getting people in the door in this transaction.

THE COURT: Adding their Social Security number would chase them away. I remind you that, you know, I'm mindful these are people who only are the people who have opted out of letting you have that information in the first place and who might've changed their minds and come back.

Do you think they're going to be scared away because they have to enter a Social Security number? That seems ridiculous. Doesn't it? I'm trying to understand, but I'm not. You want the information, but I am absolutely at a loss as to why you need it and why it would involve any other expense to you. Please help me because maybe I'm just not understanding --

## MAN 1: I think --

THE COURT: -- how this works. But what you're telling me doesn't help me at all.

MAN 1: Well, my understanding is it is relevant to the second category of expenses, the ease of bringing someone onto the system. In addition to that, it is relevant to the third category of value.

THE COURT: But in terms of the ease, if you have all the other information, the difference in ease is whether somebody's Social Security number is already there or whether they have to type in nine digits. For crying out

loud, that's nothing. That's absolutely nothing, right?

And if what you're saying is, well, that's going to chase away people who have already in the first instance decided they don't want Binance to have their information but have later changed their minds, that seems preposterous to me.

MAN 1: The third category of information, Your Honor, is the data analytics part. And whether or not someone joins the platform, the data that Voyager has about their transaction history, and I know Social Security number would be relevant to that, will empower Binance.US' data analytics programs to enhance its own operations and maximize its own profitability.

THE COURT: How? Help me with that. What does having the Social Security number allow you to do in terms of that kind of data marketing that you couldn't do without the number if you have all the other information about the customer's name and past history, etcetera?

MAN 1: I think that specific question, Your

Honor, to be fair, is a level of detail I'd have to speak to

my client about.

THE COURT: Okay. I think -- I'm not convinced that you need the Social Security numbers, and you're going to have to convince me. Because we are here, based on your proposal, only talking about whoever would affirmatively opt out of these arrangements. And I -- as I said yesterday, I

Page 17 1 understand that there are some legitimate reasons why you 2 want to have some information, and certainly some contact 3 information, etcetera. But that doesn't necessarily mean 4 there is good reason for you to have every bit of sensitive 5 information about a customer at once, particularly if a 6 customer objects and may not want to be a Binance customer. 7 And so I am trying to balance those two. And I understand 8 you push back on some of this information, but as to the 9 Social Security numbers, what you've told me so far is 10 pretty unconvincing. Okay. 11 MAN 1: Okay. Well, what I'd suggest, Your Honor, 12 is we can proceed to address the other issues and I'll --13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MAN 1: -- confer with my client. Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Very good. Is it too much to hope 16 that you might have had discussions with the governmental 17 authorities on the exculpation disputes and resolved them? 18 MS. OKIKE: Your Honor, that is too much to hope. 19 We have had discussions. 20 THE COURT: Hope springs eternal. 21 MS. OKIKE: Your Honor, I would like to read the 22 rest of the agreement with respect to the customer 23 information just --24 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Go ahead. 25 -- on the record because it does MS. OKIKE:

Page 18 1 change certain provisions in the APA. But then I'm happy to 2 address the exculpation. So the expense reimbursement start date for the seller will be moved back from March 18, 2023 3 to April 1, 2023. If --4 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MS. OKIKE: -- the purchaser is ready to close by 7 April 1, 2023, assuming the closing conditions are satisfied 8 or waived by them, and Voyager is not, including because 9 Voyager declines to waive any closing conditions other than 10 breaches or defaults by the purchaser, then Voyager will 11 cease to have the expense reimbursement protection. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MS. OKIKE: And the last point is that both 14 parties acknowledge that the closing condition relating to 15 entry and finalization of the APA order, so the prior order 16 of Your Honor authorizing entry into the APA has been 17 satisfied. And to its knowledge, there is no breach of the 18 APA by the other party as of the date of the confirmation 19 order. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MS. OKIKE: So Your Honor, with respect to the 22 exculpation, we have provided language to the various 23 governmental entities. Honestly, I'm not sure where the 24 various entities stand. I believe Texas may be okay with 25

the proviso that we are proposing with respect to the

provisions in the confirmation order related to the governmental entities. And that proviso basically says provided further, and it goes through all the things that the order is not doing in terms of enjoining governmental entities. And then says provided further that nothing in this paragraph shall limit the exculpation of the exculpated parties set forth in -- and then we put the exculpation into the confirmation order. So it's as set forth in Paragraphs 61 to 62 of this order.

THE COURT: Let me read for you and for the government my own proposal, all right? I have to note I believe is narrower than the original plan proposed to which none of these governmental entities objected. I propose to say the following. To the fullest extent permissible under applicable law, and without affecting or limiting either the Debtor release or the third-party releases, and except as otherwise specified in the plan, no exculpated parties shall have or incur, and each exculpated party is hereby exculpated from any liability for damages based on the negotiation, execution, and implementation of any transactions approved by the Court. That's the standard language we have that essentially says Creditors, shareholders, you can't sue saying somebody did something stupid when I've already made a decision that they haven't.

In addition, this is back to the language I

propose, the plan contemplates certain rebalancing transactions and the completion of distributions of cryptocurrencies to Creditors. The exculpated parties shall have no liability for and are exculpated from any claim for fines, penalties, or damages based on their execution and completion of the rebalancing transactions and the distributions of cryptocurrencies to Creditors in the manner provided in the plan. For the avoidance of doubt, the foregoing paragraph reflects the fact that confirmation of the plan requires the exculpated parties to engage in certain conduct, and the fact that no regulatory authority has taken the position during the confirmation hearing that such conduct would violate applicable laws or regulations.

Nothing in this provision shall limit in any way
the powers of any governmental unit to contend that any
rebalancing transaction should be stopped or prevented, or
that any other action contemplated by the plan should be
enjoined or prevented from proceeding further. Nor does
anything in this provision limit the enforcement of any
future regulatory or court order that requires that such
activities either cease or be modified or limit the
penalties that may be applicable if such a future regulatory
or court order is issued.

Similarly, nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Committee on foreign investment of the

United States to bar any of the contemplated transactions.

Nor does anything in this provision alter the terms of the plan regarding the compliance of the purchaser with the applicable laws in the unsupported jurisdictions before distributions of cryptocurrencies occur in those unsupported jurisdictions.

I think the language that I have just read is fairly narrow. And what it essentially says is, you know, I've got a plan in front of me. One of the things I'm supposed to consider is whether it's proposed in a means that is in compliance with law. I have a bunch of people, governmental authorities, who've done nothing except hint that maybe there's some issue, but nothing else. Nobody else made any other opposition.

And if and when I confirm the plan, people will be obligated to do what the plan says. They won't have a choice. And I think for a variety of reasons that I can say and that I can go into, they're entitled to the protection that I've just said and entitled to know that when they do what I compel them to do in between the time I do so and up until the time somebody else tells them they can't, they aren't going to be subject to some ex-post facto argument that, hey, we didn't tell you at the time even though we could've.

We didn't even make up our minds at the time, but

guess what? You're liable for penalties, and that court order wasn't just approval of a plan. It was a sentence that you, with -- under no volition of your own, would have to do something that was going to subject you to some liability. I think that would be an absurd situation for anybody to be in, and I think that language is perfectly appropriate under the applicable authorities.

Do the governmental authorities on the phone object to the language I just read?

WOMAN 1: Your Honor, this \*\*(Indiscernible) from the State of Texas. I think that language is excellent.

And subject to the deletion that's in paragraphs where we tried to craft such eloquent wording but didn't, I am fine with that wording. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BARNEA: Your Honor, this is J.D. Barnea from the U.S. Attorney's Office. We were not able to get all of that language down. There may still be some concerns we have with it, but it's certainly an improvement over what we've seen, especially if it's combined with deleting the injunctive language that was in the proposed order previously. However, we still may have some concerns about it. I think we would need to see it written. If there's any way to send it around in writing, we'd appreciate the opportunity to take a look -- a closer look.

Page 23 1 MS. CORDRY: And Your Honor, this is Karen Cordry. 2 I represent a number of other states. We did not formally 3 speak up yesterday because it seemed like the issues were 4 being raised by other folks. I think the language you have 5 there seems very appropriate. And I would note that this 6 all came up with a proviso that was only introduced on March 7 3rd before the -- on March 2nd before the SEC said anything. 8 So we think what you have there does go a very long way 9 towards dealing with our concerns while also protecting the 10 (indiscernible) efforts of the people on the -- you know, 11 who can try to put this plan together. 12 I don't think any of us meant to try to bring 13 those kind of damages and so forth. So if those assurances 14 are helpful, I think that's -- I think the language seems 15 fine. Again, sort of like the United States, I look --16 didn't actually get every bit of it down, but it sounded 17 appropriate as I was listening to it. 18 THE COURT: All right. Your Honor, I have one thing. 19 MR. SLADE: 20 THE COURT: Go ahead. 21 MR. SLADE: I apologize. Mike Slade for the 22 Debtors. 23 THE COURT: Yep. 24 MR. SLADE: There was one sentence towards the end

there where you said nothing limits the penalties that can

	Page 24
1	be imposed. I assume what you meant is if there's a future
2	decision by the government that tells gives us rules
3	THE COURT: Yeah, and if there's a
4	MR. SLADE: and if we violate those rules
5	THE COURT: If there's an order saying stop doing
6	this and you violate that order, I'm not exculpating you
7	from that.
8	MR. SLADE: That's right, but they can impose
9	penalties for the work that we did in reliance on the order
10	before they
11	THE COURT: Exactly.
12	MR. SLADE: made their decision.
13	THE COURT: Exactly.
14	MR. SLADE: Okay. We're on the same page. Thank
15	you, Your Honor.
16	MR. AZMAN: Your Honor, Darren Azman for the
17	Committee. I just have three minor comments. I don't mean
18	nick the language. I just wanted to clarify something
19	THE COURT: Well
20	MR. AZMAN: given the importance of the issues.
21	THE COURT: we don't you know, everybody
22	wants to look at (indiscernible) so let me just say that's
23	what I proposed something along those lines recognizing
24	that there may be little tweaks. But I think that
25	everybody's got the substance of it

Page 25 1 I'll keep my comment to just one point MR. AZMAN: 2 then --3 THE COURT: Okay. MR. AZMAN: -- just to make sure it's clear. 4 So 5 you mentioned that the exculpated parties could not be 6 liable for fines, penalties, or damages. I think it needs 7 to be more broader. It needs to be any civil or criminal 8 liability. I don't think fines, penalties, or damages 9 necessarily includes somebody going to jail over it. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. BARNEA: Your Honor, this is J.D. Barnea 12 It would certainly not be appropriate for this Court 13 to enjoin a criminal prosecution of any person for any 14 reason. 15 THE COURT: Well, if what you're saying is that 16 having sat on the sidelines and said nothing to me to 17 indicate that there's anything illegal about what these 18 people are going to do, that you want to reserve the right 19 to put somebody in jail for doing a rebalancing transaction 20 that they will have no choice but to do under the order that 21 I entered, then I disagree with you. I think the very 22 suggestion offends me to no end. I can't believe that you 23 would even take the position in front of me that you should have that right. It's preposterous. It's absolutely 24

preposterous. If you think something's that illegal, speak

up, but don't dare tell me that you kind of want to reserve that right to do that to somebody. Go ahead, Mr. Azman.

MR. AZMAN: Your Honor, this is not about hiding in the wings and hoping to arrest someone upon them taking some action. This is about the authority of a bankruptcy court to tell a criminal prosecutor that he's not allowed to do his job. We are not -- there is no intention here to ensnare people. We're not aware of anything specific that would be in that direction. It's simply that it's not appropriate for any court or any bankruptcy court to declare that someone is free from criminal prosecution.

If they commit a crime, they shall get prosecuted for it. If they have a defense that they were acting in reliance on a court order, that may well be an excellent defense, and perhaps that would be a reason not to prosecute them. But there's no authority that this court has to order a criminal prosecutor not to prosecute someone.

THE COURT: It's a defense to the extent that I say it's a defense, and that's what I'm doing. You know, I read the Government's paper, which essentially acknowledges that courts have held that people are entitled to qualified immunity for doing what they're approved to do, and especially what they're ordered to do under a court order. But to suggest that I should allow --

MR. AZMAN: Absolutely as an affirmative defense

in an enforcement proceeding, but not as a pre-determined bar by a bankruptcy court.

THE COURT: Okay. Please don't interrupt me in the middle of a sentence.

MR. AZMAN: I'm sorry about that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What I was trying to say is the suggestion that I should be silent and just leave it for somebody else to decide whether my order has any such qualified effect, or what I myself intend my order to have as its effect, and what I'm telling people to do is ridiculous. People who will have to do what my order will compel them to do are entitled to know, okay? And they're entitled to clarity.

And some other court who doesn't know bankruptcy is entitled to know what I think people are being compelled to do, and what I think I am authorizing them to do, and what I am in effect, at least on an interim basis until somebody actually steps in and gets an order otherwise, I'm in effect saying by confirming this plan it is okay for you to do this, okay? And none of you have stepped forward to say otherwise.

So people are -- I think I'm the one that ought to be defining that, not some future court. And leaving it to some future court in complete uncertainty, I don't know how a bankruptcy case could function. And your arguments that I

can't do this are belied completely by the fact that there are literally thousands, thousands of confirmed bankruptcy plans that have done exactly this with no objection by you. You know, you've gotten yourselves all stirred up because the Debtors overreached in what they wanted. And now you want to object to completely ordinary, reasonable provisions that are well-based in authority to which you haven't objected to any of the other bankruptcy cases that I have ever handled. So I think your position's preposterous. Go ahead, Mr. Morrissey.

MR. MORRISSEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

Richard Morrissey for the U.S. Trustee. The U.S. Trustee

will certainly review the Court's language and hopefully we

can come to an understanding. I just wanted to make two

points, Your Honor, about what the Debtors are seeking here

with respect to exculpation. And again, I hope the language

that Your Honor just read to us will be consistent with our

view.

The U.S. Trustee believes that the exculpation provision as written in the plan in these cases was different from the corresponding provision in (Indiscernible). As a factual matter, my understanding, Your Honor, is that there weren't regulatory actions pending. And in addition, there were no temporal problems, which is to say that parties in interest were not worried

about what exculpated parties might do in the future outside of the Court's purview. And I think I raised this point yesterday. So we think it was a broader release. And Your Honor, another issue is -- that I did not raise --

MAN 2: (Indiscernible) --

MR. MORRISSEY: -- yesterday has to do with --

MAN 2: -- (indiscernible). You did.

THE COURT: Who's talking -- whoever's talking on the phone needs to mute themselves because you're -- and wait until it's your turn to speak, okay?

MR. MORRISSEY: Thank you, Your Honor -- has to do with actions taken upon it by some counsel, which I think Your Honor used the word "defense" in speaking to Mr. Barnea before. I think that is certainly an affirmative defense in a future proceeding, but it's an issue as to whether that should be part of the ruling here.

THE COURT: All right. I'm not purporting in any way to modify to the extent to which reliance on the advice of counsel is or is not a defense for anybody. I'm simply saying that it's quite abundantly clear to everybody that the plan here contemplates rebalancing transactions and distributions of cryptocurrencies. Any governmental authority that thinks that those activities are illegal anyway is on notice of them and has had a full opportunity to come in and tell me why they are illegal, the Bankruptcy

Code says I shouldn't confirm it if the plan is proposed by any means that would violate any law.

I absolutely have been and made clear from the beginning that I was ready to consider any actual objections that there was a violation of law. I don't have any. I have hints that somebody might think, for reasons that I couldn't quite explain completely, that the two aspects or one aspect of the sale of VGX and perhaps something to do with Binance.US' business operations might raise regulatory issues, but no idea if that means that the transaction cannot be actually accomplished.

And therefore, based on the actual record in front of me, no reason at all to think that what the plan calls for people to do would be illegal. And so when I make that determination and then any fact by confirming the plan leave people with no authority but to do those things that I have in effect found are okay, I think it's preposterous to suggest that somebody -- people who do it would be personally liable.

You know, the alternative is to tell the

Government you had your chance, you didn't speak up. You

know, this is what the Debtors were trying to do last week.

Therefore, forever shut up, there's nothing illegal about

this. I'm not going to do that. I have no intention of

doing that. That to me would overstep what is reasonable

here.

I wish, if the regulators had a problem, that they would've spoken up before me because I have absolutely no desire to set anybody on a course that raises any regulatory concerns. But for whatever reason, the governmental entities either were unwilling or unable to voice any opposition on those points. So if something happens, if they unlock their regulatory brakes and figure out that they have some objection, they can try to stop what's going on, I'm not going to prevent them from doing that. But the idea that they should also then be able to come in and claim any kind of liability for the people who have done what I've ordered them to do and the Government took no action to stop it just seems utterly ridiculous to me. Okay?

MR. MORRISSEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. CORDRY: Your Honor, this is Karen Cordry again. If I could just say very quickly one point here which is that a typical exculpation provision does include in there in the language that the Debtor had written in another claim that we're exculpated from all of those sorts of causes of action. Unless there's a determination of actual fraud, willful misconduct, or gross negligence, which indicates that it's possible to have the basic transaction be approved, but they have some aspect of its being carried out constitute one of those problems.

And I think -- and I'm not trying to speak for the United States, but my sense is that that may be the kind of concern that is floating around there, is that the -- that's still -- I mean, it's not like we have been sitting here getting notices of every transaction that goes through in terms of the rebalancing and so forth. I have known basically from the terms that the overall rebalancing was illegal, but it is possible. And I think if we use the term "possible" that somebody could do something illegal in the context of that overall approved process. So I think that's sort of what's floating around out there. THE COURT: Yeah. You know, I don't have a problem. I don't think anybody has a problem with that. Okay? MS. CORDRY: Yep. So I think that's kind of where there was still the concern about. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Everybody's going to want to see the language and make little tweaks. I don't -- I'm not in a position to be able to give it to everybody. I have one copy, which is the copy that I have for the purpose of making my decision right now. MR. MORRISSEY: Your Honor, Richard Morrissey once again for the U.S. Trustee. I was going to raise an issue that's separate and apart from confirmation. I don't know

if you wanted me to raise it now or wait until later in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 33 1 -- later today. 2 THE COURT: Well, I have a lengthy decision to dictate into the record, and last I heard I had a 5:00 3 deadline. Where do we stand on the 5:00 issue? 4 MAN 3: Your Honor, I haven't spoken with my 5 6 client about it and whether we need more time than that. 7 hope not. 8 THE COURT: We obviously are going to -- because 9 people are going to have to see, if nothing else, the other 10 revisions that I have already told you I want to make to the 11 confirmation order and this particular language. 12 that I can announce my decision and have an order in the 13 next two hours and ten minutes is just not going to happen. 14 MAN 3: We'd like to keep things moving along, but 15 what would Your Honor suggest? 16 THE COURT: I would suggest that people are going 17 to want to -- once I finish my decision, which is going to 18 take a while, people are going to want to see the order, and 19 that you should extend it until 3:00 tomorrow. Okay. 20 MAN 3: Let me request that from my client. 21 the meantime, we could suggest perhaps sending the language 22 around to the parties via email to the Debtors. 23 THE COURT: I don't know if anybody --24 WOMAN 2: Your Honor, when the attorney for 25 Binance speaks, he has to go near a microphone.

Page 34 1 the people in Court Solutions can't hear him. 2 THE COURT: I don't think anybody has the language 3 I just read except for me because I wrote it out for myself I don't -- it's not in anything else I've given to 4 5 anybody else, so... 6 MAN 3: Correct. 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 Thank you, Your Honor. All right. MAN 3: 9 MR. MORRISSEY: Your Honor, the issue I was going 10 to raise just so it's not a mystery to the Court and the 11 parties has to do with Rule 3020. The version I have of the 12 proposed order, it's Paragraph 118, Waiver of Stay. Your 13 Honor, the U.S. Trustee would oppose the waiver of the stay. 14 We think that the 14-day stay should be part of the order, 15 and that Rule 20 should be abided by. Thank you, Your 16 Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. I understand the Government's position. When is -- if I don't enter a stay, 18 19 when is the effective date likely to occur at the earliest? 20 MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, Adam Goldberg for 21 Binance.US. We would be working to bring the plan effective 22 as quickly as possible. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 MR. GOLDBERG: I'd (indiscernible) for the Debtors 25 for anything else.

Page 35 1 MS. OKIKE: Yes, Your Honor. I think -- Christine 2 Okike for Kirkland and Ellis. We agree with that. think it's going to take, you know, some time, but we will 3 be working expeditiously to effectuate the plan. 4 5 MR. KIRPALANI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 6 Susheel Kirpalani from Quinn Emanuel on behalf of the 7 Special Committee of the Debtors. I just wanted to let the 8 Court know, I'm sure you have your own way of wanting to 9 announce things, but I wanted to confirm that Your Honor is 10 aware, and if not I wanted to make Your Honor and all 11 interested parties aware, that we have scaled back the 12 releases. 13 THE COURT: I saw. 14 MR. KIRPALANI: And I've got even some additional 15 line item nits to further scale it back because there were 16 things in there --17 THE COURT: Okay. MR. KIRPALANI: -- that I missed. And so I could 18 19 read those changes into the record, or I could do it any 20 which way you'd like. THE COURT: We'll final -- I saw an in-concept 21 22 approve of what you've done, and we'll get the wordsmithing 23 done as we enter the order. 24 MR. KIRPALANI: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I want to announce

Page 36 1 my decision with respect --2 MS. SCHEUER: Your Honor, if I may just have one 3 moment. I'm sorry, Your Honor. Therese Scheuer for the Your Honor, the SEC would also like to request the 4 5 opportunity to review the changes to the order and Your 6 Honor's proposed -- Your Honor's --7 THE COURT: Understood. 8 MS. SCHEUER: -- exculpation language. 9 THE COURT: Understood. 10 MS. SCHEUER: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Of course. I understand. All right. 12 We are here to consider the proposed confirmation of the 13 plan of reorganization of the Voyager Debtors, and also to 14 consider some other motions that have been filed by 15 Creditors. The plan contemplates a transaction that is 16 subject to some strict deadlines, so I'm going to dictate my 17 findings and conclusions into the record so that our timing 18 does not unintentionally trigger any termination rights on 19 the part of the proposed purchaser in the pending 20 transaction. 21 I'm asking the Debtors to have a transcript of my 22 rulings prepared as promptly as possible and to be submitted 23 to chambers in Word format. The decision that I dictate 24 today will explain my rulings and my findings, and we will

endeavor to enter an order as soon as we can, reasonably can

based on the rulings and findings. But once we receive the transcript, we will correct spelling, citations, inadvertent errors, and places where I may misspeak or where I may find that I was less clear than I would have liked during the course of my dictation. And that corrected decision will be entered as the actual official decision of the Court.

We had a lengthy hearing that began on Thursday,

March 2 and continued through yesterday, Monday, March 6,

and to some extent has continued for another hour's worth of

argument today. We have had an unusually large number of

participants in the hearing, including a large number of pro

se parties who are Voyager accountholders.

I want to pause and thank the pro se parties for their participation and for the unusual amount of work and energy that they have put into following this case in comparison to how relatively smaller creditors tend to treat other cases that I have handled. I appreciate that they are not attorneys, and that they have labored under some significant disadvantages as a result. I tried wherever possible over the course of the hearing to give the pro se parties the chance to ask their questions even if at times we may have strayed somewhat from the issues that are strictly before the Court in this particular hearing.

Unfortunately, I did have to exclude one pro se party who refused to abide by my instructions and who was

disrespectful in his conduct. But the pro se participants clearly have made a very significant effort to be helpful and to follow and to abide by the rules as I explained them, and I greatly appreciate the fact that they did so.

The primary issue before me in this hearing is the Debtors' request for a final approval of their Disclosure Statement and confirmation of their proposed Plan of Reorganization. The plan, as I said, generally speaking provides for a sale of customer accounts to Binance.US, although accountholders can elect not to become customers of Binance.US. The plan also includes a backup option in the event that the proposed deal with Binance.US does not close or otherwise has stopped from being completed.

The Debtors have argued that the proposed deal with Binance.US -- by the way, if I inadvertently say "Binance", I mean "Binance.US" whenever I make my comments here -- that the proposed deal with Binance.US will maximize the ability to make distributions to accountholders in the form of cryptocurrencies rather than cash. This may have tax benefits to the accountholders, although the tax issues apparently are not completely clear, and nobody has presented evidence to me or made legal submissions to me about the tax issues or tax benefits.

The Debtors have also argued that the proposed deal with Binance.US would permit more cryptocurrencies to

be distributed in-kind than any of the available
alternatives would provide. They have further argued that
the Binance.US deal would limit the amounts of
cryptocurrency sales that the Debtors would have to make,
and thereby would reduce the extent to which sales by the
Debtors might adversely affect market prices, particularly
in the case of cryptocurrencies where normal trading volumes
are not so robust as others.

The objections have focused on many things. Some objections have raised relatively common bankruptcy issues, such as objections to some of the releases that the Debtors have proposed. Other objections are focused more specifically on regulatory issues or on the wisdom of potential dealings with Binance.US.

Let me say at the outset and as background to my rulings that I cannot think of another case I have had that comes before me in quite a setting like this one does. I'm aware that there are some people who question the very concept of cryptocurrencies and the whole idea of cryptocurrency investment and trading. I note that no party in this case has taken such a position, and it's not for me to decide whether any particular investments are good ideas or not. But it certainly provides an unusual backdrop to this bankruptcy case.

I also am aware that Voyager operated and

Binance.US currently operates in a regulatory environment that can best be described as highly uncertain. There are firms that operate as cryptocurrency brokers or exchanges and have done so for several years without being subject to clearer and well-defined regulatory requirements. The regulators themselves cannot seem to agree as to whether cryptocurrencies are commodities, they may be subject to regulation by the CFTC, or whether they are securities that are subject to securities laws, or neither, or may in some cases one or the other, or even necessarily on what criteria should be applied in making a decision.

This uncertainty has persisted despite the fact that the cryptocurrency exchanges have been around for a number of years. The current regulatory environment can only be characterized as uncertain, but the future regulatory environment can only be characterized as, in my mind, virtually unknowable. There have been differing proposals in congress to adopt different types of regulatory regimes for cryptocurrency trading.

Meanwhile, the SEC has filed some actions against particular firms and with regard to particular cryptocurrencies, and those actions suggest that perhaps a wider regulatory assault may be forthcoming. The CFTC seems to have announced some positions that may be at odds with the SEC's views. But just how this will all sort itself

out, how the pending actions relating to cryptocurrencies will be decided, and just what future regulatory actions might involve, or how they will affect individual firms or the industry as a whole is very much unclear.

Complicating things further is the fact that

Voyager operated and Binance.US continues to operate in an industry that has been the subject of some severe financial shocks over the past year. Many firms were adversely affected by the loan defaults of Three Arrows, including

Voyager itself. The Three Arrows' defaults led to several bankruptcy filings across the country. The more recent and sudden collapse of FTX has reverberated even more throughout the industry and has also led to some financial problems at other firms.

Perhaps most worrisome for me are revelations of apparent misbehavior and misuse of customer assets at some firms. I certainly do not have all of the evidence as to what happened at FTX, and we will all have to wait until judgments can be entered in that case before we are sure exactly what happened. However, public statements by the persons currently handling the bankruptcy of FTX have so far indicated that there was an enormous disparity between the way that FTX actually operated and the way it actually used customer assets as opposed to what it had represented to its customers.

I'm also aware of the examiner's report about the business conducted at Celsius and how the actual behavior and custody of customer assets at that firm may have differed from public statements as to how customer assets were being treated and custodied. Once again, I certainly do not have all the evidence as to what actually happened in Celsius, and we'll have to see what further developments there are in that case. But the examiner's report certainly raised the prospect of a disparity during the way that particular firm actually operated and the representations it made to its customers about how assets were handled.

Perhaps to some degree, those kinds of events and the fact that regulatory regimes have been so unclear go hand in hand with each other. That I don't know for sure.

In this particular case, some accountholders and some other parties have referred me to newspapers, or magazine articles, or to a recent letter sent by a group of U.S. senators all raising questions and accusations about how Binance.US does business and how its affiliated companies do business.

Despite the questions that have been raised in this regard, however, I have to note that I have been offered absolutely no, I mean literally zero, no actual admissible evidence that would support an accusation that Binance.US is misusing customer assets or is engaged in any

misbehavior of any kind at all. Instead, I am in the absolute unenviable position of having to make a ruling about the proposed transaction in the face of hearsay accusations of potential wrongdoing in an industry where other firms have apparently engaged in real wrongdoing.

Knowing that many people are raising questions, and certainly with no desire to put anybody's futures at stake, but with little or more accurately no evidence as to whether there was any good basis at all for any of the questions that have been raised about Binance.US. So with those observations to put things into context, let me turn to some of the actual objections that have been filed.

The first one that I will address is the objection filed by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The SEC has argued in its written objection that the Debtors cannot prove the feasibility of their proposed plan for two reasons. First, the SEC argued that in its view the Debtors had the burden to prove that the Debtors' own purchases and sales of cryptocurrencies would not constitute illegal purchases and sales of securities.

The objection did not take the position that any particular cryptocurrencies are securities or otherwise explain how or why the Debtors' activities, including their rebalancing activities, might be illegal, although their written objection did contain a vague footnote suggesting

that the VTX token was one as to which some unspecified issue might exist.

The SEC also suggested that the Debtors should be required to prove that Binance.US is not operating as a securities broker without registering as such. Once again, the SEC did not actually take the position that Binance.US is operating as an unregistered and unlicensed securities broker. Instead, it just suggested that the Debtors had the burden to prove the negative without offering any evidence or even any reasons to think that Binance.US actually was doing anything for which it required further SEC registrations.

I questioned the SEC about these objections at the outset of this hearing, and to some extent I rebuked the SEC attorneys for the vagueness of their submission, although in fairness to them, I think they were just the messengers and not necessarily the architects of the message that they were sent to deliver to me. Although the SEC contended that the Debtors somehow how to prove a negative, that is that the Debtors were not violating securities laws and that Binance.US is not violating registration requirements for brokers.

Once again, the SEC confirmed that it was not affirmatively contending that the Debtors were doing anything wrong, nor that Binance.US was doing anything

wrong. Nor did the SEC have any guidance to offer to any of us to suggest what it was that the Debtors allegedly were supposed to prove with respect to these issues, or how the Debtors could possibly prove what the SEC wanted them to prove without receiving any explanation at all from the SEC and suggest why the Debtors' activities or Binance.US' operations might raise legal issues.

Near the end of the hearing on Friday, the SEC asked to provide clarification of the SEC's legal position. It initially asked if it could state its position only to me on an in-camera basis, but I denied that request and ruled that, to the extent the SEC wanted to say something further about its objection, it ought to be stated in the public forum where all interested parties could hear and understand the SEC's position.

The SEC representatives then said the following on the record. First, we were told that the SEC staff believes that the VGX token has aspects of a security, but that the Commission itself has not taken any position on that subject. Second, we were told that the SEC staff believes that Binance.US is operating as a securities exchange without registering as such. Once again, the Commission itself has not taken any position on that subject.

Although the SEC offered these clarifications as to what the SEC staff apparently believes, it emphasized

that only the Commission may take a formal position on behalf of the SEC, and that the views of the staff did not necessarily constitute or certainly did not constitute the official views of the SEC. Furthermore, although the SEC had obtained clearance to reveal the staff's contentions, the SEC confirmed that it was not authorized and did not intend to provide any evidence on these issues or even any further explanation as to the bases for whatever beliefs the SEC staff may have.

So to the extent that the SEC nevertheless contends that these issues are bars to the confirmation of the Debtors' plan, I am forced to disagree. In the first place, I reject the contention that the Court and the Debtors somehow were supposed to figure out for themselves just what it is that the SEC might argue about the VGX token, or about particular activities in which Binance.US might be engaged, as well as the reasons why those matters might have raised securities issues, and then somehow to offer evidence and legal argument to rebut them.

This bankruptcy case has been pending since July 2022. Customers and Creditors have been denied access to their assets for many months, and they deserve to have a resolution of this case. Bankruptcy cases also are very expensive, and each and every delay means that administrative expenses eat away at the recoveries that

Creditors may eventually receive.

I have a proposed Plan of Reorganization in front of me, and I have an obligation to make a ruling now as to whether it can be confirmed. I cannot simply put the entire case in an indeterminate and expensive deep freeze while regulators figure out whether they do or do not think there is any problem with the transactions that are being proposed.

As I said at the outset of the hearing, if a regulator believes there is a legal issue with respect to something that is proposed in front of me, I am more than anxious to hear an explanation and to consider that issue.

I have no desire to approve anything that raises legal issues. But I expect a regulator not only to tell me that it has an actual objection if there is a legal issue, but also to tell me what the issue is and why it is an issue, that the other parties may address it and so that I may make a proper and well-considered ruling on the point.

Here, I don't know how any party could possibly be expected to address the SEC's comments with the limited guidance that the SEC has provided. The SEC has not explained by the VGX token in its mind should be regarded as a security or what aspects of a security it thinks it has leaving me only to guess as to what the arguments might have been.

Similarly, the SEC did not explain why it thought Binance.US might be operating as a securities broker. I do not know, for example, if there is one specific cryptocurrency token that may have been traded by Binance.US and that the SEC thinks was a security for which the relevant remedy might simply be to stop trading in that token, or whether the SEC has different theories. If we were to try to address the issues, we would have to guess just what the issues were and would not even have any idea if we were even discussing the right points.

I understand and appreciate that the SEC is limited in what it can say about potential enforcement actions, but I cannot conclude from this record that an enforcement action is even likely, let alone whether it is meritorious, or even the bases for any of the issues that an enforcement action might raise.

I also cannot determine, even if an action were meritorious, whether it would affect the transactions that I am being asked to approve. On this very point, for example, I asked the SEC's counsel at the outset of this hearing to explain what the consequences would be if Binance.US were to be found to have been acting as a non-registered broker/dealer. I asked if that would just mean that Binance.US might have to stop certain activities while it pursued a license, or if it would be that Binance.US would

have to shut down all of its activities. The SEC said it could not answer the question.

Notwithstanding that statement, the SEC took the position yesterday that the Debtor's disclosure statement allegedly was deficient because it did not more specifically predict and describe what the results of a regulatory action against Binance.US might be. As I said yesterday, I do not know how the Debtors could've been expected to be more specific about that question when the SEC itself told me it could not answer the question.

In addition, the SEC's argument on these points has all been phrased in terms of whether the Debtors can prove the feasibility of their proposed plan. Feasibility in bankruptcy parlance is a shorthand reference to the provisions of Section 1129(a) (11) of the Bankruptcy Code, which states that in order to confirm a plan, a court must find that the confirmation "is not likely to be followed by the liquidation or the need for further financial reorganization of the Debtor or any successor to the Debtor under the plan unless such liquidation or reorganization is proposed in the plan."

Here the only issues the SEC has raised are, A, whether one specific token, VGX's, is a security; and B, whether Binance.US needs to register as a securities broker. There is no reason why these issues affect feasibility of

the kind that is discussed in Section 1129(a)(11). As I've said, the SEC has been aware that the VGX token for some time it has not even reached a conclusion of its own as to whether it is a security, let alone taken any action to stop trading in the token.

In addition, even if there are problems with the sale or distribution of VGX, there's no reason why, to my knowledge, why that should interfere or impede or affect the remainder of what the Debtors are proposing. Similarly, even if Binance.US were to be told to stop its business entirely, the Debtors' plan in this case provides that what the parties have called a toggle option under which the Binance.US deal could be stopped and the Debtors would instead make distributions to the extent they could without using Binance.US.

There would have to be some practical changes as a result, and the recoveries that accountholders would receive would likely diminish, but the plan itself includes the toggle option. So there's no reason to think that the issues that the SEC has raised as to Binance.US would mean that the plan couldn't proceed or that it would need a further liquidation or reorganization of the kind that is not already contemplated by the plan. For that reason, the issues raised by the SEC do not really go to the feasibility of the plan as that term is used in Section 1129(a)(11) of

the Bankruptcy Code.

I appreciate that the SEC made some effort to tell me something about what the staff is thinking, but in the end it did not support the highly conditional objection that the SEC filed. This is a court. One of the requirements for confirmation of plan is that the plan has been proposed in good faith and not by any means forbidden by law.

Obviously, I have no intention of approving anything that is illegal. As I said during the hearing, and I think I may be repeating myself now, I expect that if a regulator believes that what is being proposed in a plan would violate any applicable statute or regulation, that the regulator will bring that to my attention so the issue can be resolved.

The SEC and all other government agencies have had a full and fair opportunity to object here if they believe that the rebalancing transactions that are being proposed or the distributions of cryptocurrencies that are being contemplated are illegal in any way. Or if they're in violative of any statute, rule or regulation, they have not actually made any objection on those grounds. They have only vaguely hinted at issues that have not even been described in a manner that would permit the Court or the parties to address them.

I have to make decisions based on actual admissible evidence. I have no evidence here from the SEC

or any other party that could support a contention that

Voyager is purchasing or selling any token that should be

considered to be an unregistered security, or that

Binance.US is engaged in any activity for which it is

required to register as a broker dealer.

I therefore reject and overrule any contention that the transactions contemplated by the plan would be illegal, and any suggestion that for regulatory reasons the Debtors would be unable to complete their proposed liquidation. The Debtors have offered evidence that Binance.US has the operational and financial capability to perform its obligations and have not been given any evidence to suggest that Binance.US could not legally perform those obligations.

For similar reasons, I reject the contentions by the SEC and others to the effect that the Debtors allegedly did not offer sufficient disclosure about potential regulatory risks. The disclosure statement that was distributed included specific disclosures about regulatory issues faced in so-called unsupported jurisdictions where Binance.US does not have certain regulatory licenses.

It also stated that the Debtors' business is subject to an extensive and highly evolving regulatory landscape that involves significant uncertainties, that it is possible that governmental bodies might disagree as to

whether particular laws or regulations are applicable to the Debtors or to the contemplated transactions, that the Debtors could not predict whether regulators would take the position that additional regulatory approvals are required for the completion of the contemplated transactions, and could not guarantee that there would not be regulatory issues.

The disclosure statement also stated generally that consummation of the transactions might depend on obtaining approvals of some governmental units, and that failure to obtain those approvals could prevent or impose limitations or restrictions on the consummation of the transactions contemplated by the plan.

Voyager also disclosed all of the regulatory inquiries it had received from federal and state authorities, and nobody has contended to the contrary. Although I note that none of those inquiries related to the two issues that the SEC said that its staff had concerns about. The disclosure statement disclosed a subpoena from the SEC that Voyager had received in January 2022 relating to the Voyager rewards program and apparently to questions about whether Voyager needed to register as an investment company.

The disclosure statement revealed that the SEC had made a follow-up request for some financial statement

information and other internal documentation in July 2022, and that the CFTC had made inquiries and sent a subpoena in August and September 2022. And other state and federal inquiries are also described.

I do not believe that the disclosure statement, which was circulated in January 2023, needed to be any more specific than that, than what it said, particularly with regard to issues that SEC itself did not identify until March 2023, and that the SEC itself has not been able to explain in anything other than an extremely conclusory form.

A number of questions have also been raised about the extent to which accountholders would be protected if they were to become customers of Binance.US. These objections have been posed by the SEC, the Office of the United States Trustee, the State of Texas, and the State of New York. Nobody suggests that the Debtors had information that they were hiding from anyone or that the Debtors had and failed to disclose. Nobody has contended that the Debtors made any misrepresentations as to the Debtors' own conclusions about Binance.US.

Instead, the objecting parties have suggested that the Debtors should have obtained or should obtain different or more complete or better assurances from Binance.US as to how it handles and will handle customer assets, and then have argued that the prior disclosures supposedly were

inadequate because they did not already anticipate or include the results of these additional discussions or assurances that the objecting parties think the Debtors should obtain.

Although these objections have been framed as complaints about the disclosures that were included in the disclosure statement, I do not believe that is an accurate way to characterize them. As I said during the hearing, it is more accurate to say that these are substantive questions masquerading as disclosure issues. They are substantive complaints about what the Debtors have done or should be doing to assure themselves of a lack of problems before the transaction closes rather than proper objections to the disclosures that the Debtors already made.

The Debtors have made clear that their due diligence as to Binance.US does business is a constant ongoing project, and that the Debtors will continue to ask questions and to seek assurances as issues are raised. We would all be horrified if the Debtors did not do so. It is simply wrong for various parties to suggest that the January 23, 2023 disclosure statement was somehow inadequate because it did not describe all of the follow-up conversations that had not yet taken place, or all of the follow-up assurances that had not yet been received by the Debtors.

If I were to impose such a standard, it would

mean, in effect, that the Debtors would have to stop their due diligence inquiries once a disclosure statement had been approved for fear that the prior disclosures would immediately be rendered deficient and that the entire expensive process would have to start over again to bring everything forward to what the Debtors had more recently discovered. That would be an absurd result.

I do not find anything deficient in what the disclosure statement actually said. First, the disclosure statement revealed that cryptocurrencies would be transferred to Binance.US only as and when they were to be distributed to customers, and that until such time as the distributions were completed, Binance.US would receive and hold the cryptocurrencies "solely in a custodial capacity in trust and solely for the benefit of accountholders who each open an account on the Binance.US platform."

Second, Pages 34 to 36 of the disclosure statement revealed that the Debtors had sought and obtained various assurances from Binance.US, including that Binance.US had the financial resources to complete the proposed transaction, that Binance.US maintains 100 percent reserves for its customers' digital assets, and had substantial capital remaining even if all customers were to withdraw all of their digital assets, that Binance.US does not lend any of its customers' assets or offer margin products on its

platform, that customer assets transferred to Binance.US would be held by Binance.US pursuant to its standard digital asset wallet infrastructure, which is stored on Amazon Web Services servers located in Northern Virginia and Tokyo, and that Binance.US has various security protocols in place to ensure the safe storage of customer assets, and that those security protocols have achieved various third-party expert certifications attesting to their compliance with industry standards.

During the hearing, the Debtors also described other requests for information that they had made and other assurances they had sought. That included testimony that Binance.US had been asked to provide and had provided a sworn statement as to certain of its business practices. At my request, the Debtors obtained the consent of Binance.US to offer that sworn certificate as evidence of the diligence the Debtors had conducted and as evidence of the bases for the conclusions the Debtors had reached.

The certificate was admitted into evidence and filed on the docket so that all parties could see it. It is dated February 28, 2023, and it states that Binance.US holds digital assets deposited by its customers solely in a custodial capacity and on a one-to-one reserve basis, that Binance.US segregates the customer assets from the company's digital assets on its general ledger, that only employees of

Binance.US are able to move or withdraw customer assets, that Binance.US does not lend or rehypothecate customer assets, and that Binance.US maintains security protocols and procedures that are reviewed by independent parties, and that comply with various applicable standards.

This evidence does not satisfy everyone. It's apparent that there are some objectors who are worried about news reports and who would prefer to have nothing to do with Binance.US. During cross-examination, more than a few objectors pointed out that FTX had also made representations to the Debtors, and that those statements turned out to be false. Though in fairness, the witnesses have testified that they have ramped up their investigations and increased the information and assurances that they have sought from Binance.US in light of what happened with FTX.

I do not mean to cast dispersions on Binance.US when I say this, but it is of course true that in the end we can never be 100 percent sure that a representation is true and correct even when made under oath. At the same time, however, we do not usually presume that people are lying and we certainly do not usually presume that buyers are dishonest, particularly absence of any evidence suggesting that they actually are.

My role as the bankruptcy judge is, in the first instance here, to determine whether the proposed plan

complies with the provisions of the bankruptcy code itself. As to the business details and the business wisdom of the arrangement, and as to the selection of the proposed purchaser, my role is more limited. So long as the provisions of the plan comply with the bankruptcy code requirements, my authority is limited to a determination of whether the Debtor's desire to do this particular transaction is within the scope of the Debtors' reasonable business judgment. See In re Borders Group, Inc., 453 B.R. 477, 482 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2011) and cases cited therein.

Furthermore, as I've said several times, in considering that issue, I am required to make decisions based on the evidence that is submitted to me. I understand the point of view of the skeptics here. Given what has happened in this industry, I cannot help but be worried myself about how any firm might handle customer assets in this business. But the plan fact of the matter is that I have been given absolutely no admissible evidence, literally none, that would support a conclusion that Binance.US will misuse customer assets or that it cannot be trusted. The evidence that is actually before me requires me to conclude that the Debtors are exercising reasonable business judgment in electing to proceed with the transaction.

I'm going to continue in a moment, but we're going to take a brief break while I give my throat a brief rest.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Please be seated. All right. I had just explained why I believe that the evidence requires me to conclude that the Debtors are exercising reasonable business judgement in electing to proceed with the transaction.

That does not mean that I thought that every detail of the proposed transaction was necessary or even appropriate. During the course of the hearing, I asked the Debtors and Binance U.S. to consider certain changes to the terms of their proposed arrangement that I believed would not affect the primary business terms but that would help to address other concerns and questions that had been raised.

U.S. deal was clarified to say, and my order entered in January clearly says that from the time when assets are transferred to Binance U.S. until the time they are distributed to accountholders, Binance U.S. would be acting as a distribution agent for Voyager. Accordingly, during that time, Binance U.S. would only be a nominal owner of the assets. They would not have any beneficial interest in the assets during that distribution period, and instead, the assets would be held strictly in trust for and in a custody arrangement for either the debtors or the accountholders respectively. Binance U.S. has also previously confirmed

that customers may immediately withdraw assets from Binance U.S. if they choose to do so.

During the hearing, I suggested that it might make sense if what I have referred to as the distribution period, the period during which Binance is deemed to have no beneficial interest in the assets, were to continue for some time after a customer's account is credited so that customers who wanted to make immediate withdrawals could do so without sacrificing any of the protections that the provisions of the order might provide to them in that regard.

Binance U.S. has not only agreed to that suggested change, I think the parties have gone further. They have agreed with the Debtor to include language in the plan documents to the effect that the assets transferred to Binance by Voyager, if I'm reading it correct, will always be held in strict trust and in custody for customers and that Binance will not have beneficial interest of those assets. That language now appears in Article 4, Section C of the plan.

Second, I asked that the parties consider a change to the proposed treatment of accountholders who live in what the parties have called unsupported jurisdictions, which are four states in which Binance does not have the licenses necessary to distribute cryptocurrencies to customers. I

noted that under the parties' contract, customers in other states who do not become customers of Binance U.S. or who would just prefer cash distributions for other reasons will be given cash distributions at the end of a three-month period. I understand and will address below the issues that have been raised regarding the fact that customers in most states will be able to receive distributions in the form of cryptocurrencies whereas customers in the unsupported jurisdictions will have to wait six months to see if Binance U.S. can obtain the needed approvals and will only be able to get cash distributions if Binance U.S. cannot get such approvals.

The question that I raised with the parties, however, is as to accountholders in unsupported jurisdictions who do not want to become Binance U.S. customers and who would prefer to take a cash distribution. Customers in most states can get -- excuse me. Under the original proposal, customers in most states could get such cash distributions after three months. And so I raised the question as to why customers in unsupported jurisdictions should not have that same opportunity. I suggested that it could be made available by giving customers a simple opt-out form by which they could elect to take cash distributions and thereby would be entitled to them at the completion of the same three-month period. Binance U.S. agreed to this

proposed change and the change has been incorporated in the plan documents.

Third, I know that the parties' agreement includes provisions requiring the transfer of customer data from Voyager to Binance U.S. Voyager has argued that its customer arrangements permit the transfer of that data. No party has offered me any contrary evidence or contention.

Under the parties' agreement as I understand it, the only customer data that has been transferred so far is as to customers who have already made elections to be customers of Binance U.S. However, if there is an approval of the transaction, there would be a wholesale transfer to Binance U.S. of all remaining customer data, which would mean that Binance U.S. would receive all customer data for all Voyager customers even if those customers elect not to do business with Binance U.S.

I asked whether these terms could be modified to provide further protections with regard to the sensitive customer information of customers who might choose not to be Binance customers and who may not wish Binance U.S. to have their information.

I recognize that one of the things that Binance
U.S. is buying here is the right to market itself to
Voyager's customers. I asked, however, whether the transfer
of customer data to Binance could be limited to customer

contact information in the first instance with the limitation of the transfer of other more sensitive information about bank accounts, social security numbers, et cetera, to such time as a particular customer actually elects to be a Binance U.S. customer.

And in response to my concerns, the parties have tentatively agreed that customers will have a two-week optout period in which time they would be able to notify the parties and to opt out of any transfer of any selfies or uploaded IDs or bank statements or bank account information, thereby giving them the chance to prevent the transfer of that information to Binance.

In my mind, there's still one open issue, which is as to the transfer of social security numbers and whether customers within that same two-week opt-out period should have the right to prevent the transfer of their social security numbers automatically to Binance U.S.

Binance U.S. has suggested to me that somehow this information is important to making it -- putting Binance U.S. into a position where it could readily open a customer account if a customer wishes to do so. But I don't really understand if Binance has all the other information just how hard it would be for a customer at that time simply to enter a social security number. Yes.

MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, I can provide

Page 65 1 additional information on this point now or at any other 2 time. THE COURT: Go ahead. 3 MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. I apologize 5 for interrupting, but I thought this was a good time. 6 For the record, Adam Goldberg of Latham & Watkins 7 on behalf of Binance U.S. 8 I've consulted with my client on this issue and 9 can provide additional details of why the social security 10 numbers are of great value to this transaction. 11 There are essentially two levels of KYC checks 12 pursuant to the FinCEN CIP rule, that is the Financial 13 Crimes Enforcement Network, which is a Bureau of the 14 Department of Treasury Customer Identification Program. 15 The first level is basic KYC, and that requires a 16 name, date of birth, address and social security number. 17 The second is advanced. And that requires selfies, identification documents, and other document uploads. 18 19 Binance U.S. has agreed to forego the transfer of the 20 information that goes to the advanced KYC, which is of 21 higher long-term value, but is prepared to do so based on 22 Your Honor's comments. 23 The social security networks allow Binance U.S. to clear all of Voyager's customers through the basic level one 24 25 KYC at no additional cost. And that KYC clearance would

remain in place forever, indefinitely, under the current regulations.

If we don't have that information, the KYC data that would be otherwise acquired, not including social security numbers as Your Honor has requested, that would become stale and would eventually require, should a customer later elect to join the Binance U.S. platform, for example at a time of a bull run in the crypto markets and they change their mind, the cost at present could be up to \$20 per customer. And recall there are a million customers in this case, perhaps without coincidence, of the alignment of those figures.

U.S. would essentially be acquiring a mailing list for customer marketing, which is of far inferior value relative to the ability to pre-clear for KYC. So we respectfully submit, Your Honor, that the transfer of social security numbers is permitted under the policy and that that transfer is supported by the Debtor's business judgement, the value to the estate, and the overwhelming creditor vote.

THE COURT: Thank you. That's very helpful. But I think you said at an earlier time during the hearing that if a customer has a Binance account and closes it, that the customer can elect to have Binance wipe out all of the data it has for that customer. Is that right?

MR. GOLDBERG: Yes. That's right, Your Honor.

There are a few requirements, such as that there is no
pending trades on the account. But yes, the customer can
delete their account.

THE COURT: So what about for people who haven't become Binance customers? Do they have an equivalent point at which they can ask you to wipe out the information that you have on them?

MR. GOLDBERG: They would have to -- under the current system, they would have to join, create an account, and then they could delete that account.

THE COURT: Seems like an odd step to require people to go through. Is there some point at which -- I understand you want a marketing period. Isn't there some point at which you can say that those people who haven't joined you in six months can have the same option to tell you to delete their information as somebody who had already joined you would have?

MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, I completely understand your logic here. And it has some resonance. But I think the context of this deal is really from a retail perspective. We want the ability to welcome a customer at any time. And that's the value of this transaction. We want a customer to be able to come into the store and see the platform. And if they want to delete themselves after

Page 68 1 that, they are welcome to do so. And that's the business 2 agreement that was reached among the parties. So they could join the platform, never buy or sell 3 4 anything, and then cancel out and tell you to get rid of the 5 information. 6 MR. GOLDBERG: That's right, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. Thanks. I appreciate the 8 explanation. 9 MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you. THE COURT: All right. To get back to my 10 11 decision, I have raised issues about the information that 12 would be transferred and as to abilities of any customers to control the information that's been transferred. Binance 13 14 U.S. has agreed that there will be a two-week period during 15 which customers can opt out of the transfer of selfies, 16 uploaded IDs, bank statements, and bank account information. 17 I have raised the question about the transfer of social 18 security numbers and Binance has now given me a better 19 explanation of why it wants that information. 20 I have a lingering concern that, as I just said to counsel, the testimony is that customers who actually open 21 22 Binance accounts can close them immediately and can 23 immediately tell Binance to dispose of all the information

that Binance has obtained about them, whereas customers who

don't open accounts can only exercise that right if they

24

Page 69 1 first go through the process of opening account and never 2 even putting anything in it and then giving that same direction to Binance. I'm still not a thousand percent 3 4 convinced that there isn't some way to give Binance the 5 marketing opportunity it wants here while eventually making 6 it easier for customers to have their data expunged, whether 7 at the end of a six-month period or some other period. And 8 I will leave open the possibility of such a provision in the 9 final order and just ask Binance, since I have only just 10 this very instant raised this question, if it will yet take 11 that additional question from the pestering judge back to 12 its client and find out if there's something we can do. 13 Okay? 14 MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: By the way, do we have confirmation 16 that we don't have a 5:00 deadline? Because at this pace, I 17 won't even be finished with my decision by then. MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, Binance U.S. agrees to 18 19 your request of 3:00 p.m. tomorrow. 20 THE COURT: Thank you very much. All right. 21 I think that these proposed modifications, subject 22 to answering that one issue that I have just left, clears up 23 many of the objections and issues that came up during the

hearing. There are still some other issues that I will now

proceed to discuss.

24

The Office of the United States Trustee raised some other objections to the disclosure statement. One objection was their contention that the disclosure statement was not clear as to who would hold cryptocurrencies and in what capacities. I actually think the disclosure statement was clear on that point. It said, as I noted above, that cryptocurrencies would only be transferred to Binance U.S. as and when they would be distributed to accountholders, that until the distributions were complete, Binance U.S. would only have a nominal and not a beneficial interest in the assets to be transferred, and that all such assets would be held in custody and in trust either for the Debtor's or for the account holders as applicable.

I believe that these disclosures were sufficient.

And, as I have described above, the parties have actually agreed to additional language to provide further assurances to customers in this regard.

The SEC complained that the Debtors did not disclose or that there are meaningful economic benefits to the Binance U.S. transaction apart from the \$20 million that Binance would pay -- Binance U.S. would pay in excess of the cryptocurrencies being transferred. I am going to overrule this objection.

The liquidation analysis that was attached to the disclosure statement included projections as to what

creditors' recoveries would be under the Binance U.S.

proposal, under the alternative toggle proposal, and under a

Chapter 7 liquidation. It stated that for various reasons

that were explained in the footnotes, the Debtors believe

that the Binance proposal would make approximately \$90

million more available for distribution, resulting in

approximately five percent greater recoveries for creditors

when compared to the toggle option and about a 14 percent

increase when compared to a possible Chapter 7 liquidation.

I think those calculations were sufficient to disclose what

the Debtors believed as to the benefits of the Binance U.S.

proposal.

Now, during the hearing, there were many questions about these calculations. The Debtors testified that their current estimates are that the Binance deal will produce approximately \$100 million more in distributable assets than the so-called toggle plan would provide. The Debtors explained the assumptions that underlie those calculations, and of course many of them are based on assumptions of what might happen in the market under certain conditions, and therefore they are not guarantees by any means. But I did find the explanations and testimony to be reasonable and credible. And I note that no contrary evidence was presented.

The State of Texas contended that the disclosure

statement was insufficient because it did not make sufficient disclosures about certain features of the Binance U.S. terms of use. However, I note that the disclosure statement contains many direct links to those terms of use and all of the arguments about provisions that Texas believes customer should know about are taken directly from the terms of use to which the customers were directed. This is not an argument about actual disclosures and about actual information available to customers so much as it is a contention made in hindsight that the Debtors should have put greater emphasis on particular provisions that Texas at this stage thinks are important and that the Debtor should have highlighted them somehow more prominently in the disclosure statement instead of making available by referring customers to the places where they could be found.

I do not find this to be a reason to reject the disclosure statement or a basis on which to decide that the disclosure statement was not adequate and sufficient. I must note that the State of Texas reviewed the proposed disclosure statement before I gave preliminary approval to it in January 2023 and that the State of Texas filed some objections and comments at that time and that in those objections, Texas did not ask for any further disclosures about the Binance U.S. terms of use. That just supports my conclusion that this is not really a complaint about

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

something that was material and that had to be disclosed or highlighted so much as it is a kind of belated decision by one party that maybe something could have been given greater emphasis. But if I were to apply that standard to every disclosure statement that I ever see, I'm not sure any of them would ever pass.

Texas has also complained that the disclosure statement allegedly did not disclose the potential effects that a preference lawsuit by Alameda could have on creditor recoveries. However, the figures quoted in the objection as to how much recoveries would be affected were taken from Exhibit C to the disclosure statement itself, at Page 198 of 140, ECF Document 863.

During argument, Texas contended that the information was too hard to find, but I note that the information was added to the disclosure statement after there was discussion of the point in January 2023. And at that time, I approved the addition of the information at exactly the place where it ultimately appears. To my recollection, no party complained at that time that it should be placed elsewhere.

Texas has also complained that the disclosures about creditors' recoveries -- complained in its written objection, I should say, that the disclosures about creditors' recoveries might suggest that recoveries under

the plan could be less than they would be in a Chapter 7 liquidation. I don't think Texas is actually continuing to press this objection. But just for completeness in the record, I will describe it and describe the reasons why I think it has been withdrawn.

The problem with the written objection is that it was based on an apples to oranges comparison. More specifically, Texas compared what the plan recoveries would be if Alameda has a very large, \$400 million administrative claim against the estate compared to what the Chapter 7 recoveries would be if Alameda does not have such a claim.

The truth, however, is that if Alameda has a large administrative claim, it would have the same claim in both the plan in Chapter 7 liquidation contexts and would have the same proportionate impact on the recoveries in both contexts. So it therefore would not affect the Debtor's conclusion that the plan recoveries will be better than recoveries in Chapter 7 would be.

A number of parties have also objected to the releases that have been proposed in the plan. Some of these objections are based on misconceptions as to exactly how the releases work. Just to be clear, the Debtors have proposed to release some claims that the Debtors themselves otherwise would be able to pursue or that the estate would be able to pursue. Some other parties, Binance U.S. itself for

example, and the Debtor's officers and directors, have agreed to release claims that they might own against the Debtors and a long list of other parties.

In addition, creditors were given the opportunity, and shareholders, to elect to grant releases, or in bankruptcy terms, to opt in to releases if they chose to do so. However, the forms that were sent to creditors made clear that nobody was obligated to opt in and that the choice was strictly voluntary.

Many bankruptcy plans provide and there is case authority for the proposition that an affirmative vote in favor of a plan is itself a consent to the grant of releases that are set forth in the plan. But the plan in this case does not say that. Instead, the plan here provides that no creditor or shareholder has released any claims that are owned by that person or entity unless that person has affirmatively granted such a release by executing the optout release form.

I believe that this disposes of the objection filed by the Federal Trade Commission and quote relevant portions of the objections posed by the United States

Trustee and by certain customers, including Mr. Newsom and Warren, Mr. Hendershott, Mr. Jones, and Mr. (indiscernible).

They objected to the approval of non-consensual third-party releases, but there are no non-consensual third-party

releases here. There is a separate issue regarding the exculpation provisions of the plan that I will discuss in a moment, but there are no non-consensual third-party releases.

There are also challenges to some of the settlements and releases of the Debtor's own claims that are included in the plan. The United States Trustee filed an objection stating that the released party and releasing party definitions should not include the winddown debtors.

My understanding is that that change has been made and that this particular objection is moot.

The Debtors have also proposed a settlement of claims against the Debtors' CEO, Mr. Ehrlich, and a former chief financial officer, Mr. Psaropoulos. The Debtors offered evidence that two independent directors had been in charge of the investigation of claims against certain insiders, that the special committee hired outside counsel, the Quinn Emanuel firm, to assist in that investigation, that the special committee had concluded that the only claims against insiders that were worth pursuing were claims against Mr. Ehrlich and Mr. Psaropoulos relating to the Three Arrows loans, that the special committee further concluded that those claims would be subject to various defenses and that the Debtors did not believe and that the directors, excuse me, did not believe that the claims were

slam dunks, that the committee had investigated -- special committee had investigated the officers' resources and that the proposed settlements would provide for payments that represent a significant portion of the officers' available assets, that the Debtors would release other claims against the two officer but would not actually release claims relating to the Three Arrows loans and instead would only agree that any further recoveries on the Debtor's claims as to those loans would come from insurance proceeds and not from the individual assets of the settling defendants.

The Debtors also reserve their rights to undo a transaction by which Voyager allegedly paid as much as \$10 million just before its bankruptcy filing for an additional \$10 million of director and officer liability coverage.

When considering a settlement such as this, the applicable Second Circuit authority makes clear that my role is to determine whether the Debtors' decision to settle was a reasonable one after considering a number of factors.

In this case, consistent with the applicable caselaw, I have considered the nature of the claims that would have been asserted, the legal defenses that could have been asserted, including the business judgement defense, the testimony about additional defenses that could have been asserted under the terms of certain exculpatory language in the Debtor's bylaws or other governing documents, the

benefits of the proposed settlement, testimony that the settlement was the result of arm's length bargaining, the testimony about the size of the settlement payments in relation to the settling parties' resources, the fact that the settlements preserve the Debtor's rights to pursue the Three Arrows claim further, though further recoveries on such claims would be limited to insurance proceeds, the competency and experience of the counsel retained by the special committee, and the support for the settlement by the official committee of unsecured creditors. See Iridium Operating LLC v. Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (In re Iridium Operating LLC), 478 F.3d 452, 462 (2d Cir. 2007), citations omitted.

I conclude after considering the relevant factors that the settlement with Mr. Ehrlich and Mr. Psaropoulos is a reasonable one and should be approved. I understand that this is very disappointing to some of the pro se parties who have appeared, a number of whom expressed a strong resentment towards the two settling parties and who expressed a strong desire to pursue them more vigorously and to demand a higher percentage of their net worth as a part of any settlement. I sympathize with their frustrations, but the only actual evidence I have on these relevant points is the evidence that I have described. And I am forced to conclude from that evidence that the settlement is in fact a

reasonable one.

were not limited to the releases to be granted as part of the settlement with Mr. Ehrlich and Mr. Psaropoulos.

Instead, the Debtors also proposed to grant broad release of claims that the debtors might have against a number of other parties. The parties who would be the beneficiaries of those releases included the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors and its members together with a long list of released professionals which appeared to include all of the law firms and other advisors in these cases, plus all "released Voyager employees", a term which was defined as "all directors, officers, and persons employed by each of the Debtors and their affiliates serving in such capacity on or after the petition date but before the effective date."

The scope of the releases that the Debtors

proposed to give to such persons was extremely broad. The

releases proposed to free all released parties from all

cause of action, known or unknown, that the Debtors could

have asserted in their own right "or on behalf of the holder

of any claim." I really do not understand this latter

phrase at all. If it is somehow intended to mean that a

third party's own claim would be released on the theory that

the Debtor somehow could have asserted it in some kind of

representative capacity, it is too vague and excessive and I

won't allow it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The plan also proposed to release all of the released parties from any claim of any kind that the Debtors might have against those released parties. And the phrase goes on and on. "Based on or relating to or in any manner arising from in whole or in part the Debtors...their capital structure, the purchase, sale, or rescission of the purchase or sale of any security of the Debtors, the subject matter of or the transactions giving rise to any claim or interest that is treated in the plan, the business or contractual arrangements between any debtor and any released party, the Debtor's out-of-court restructuring efforts, intercompany transactions between or among a debtor and another debtor, or upon any other act or omission, transaction, agreement, event, or other occurrence related to the Debtors taking place on or before the effective date but with an exclusion for actual fraud, willful misconduct, or gross negligence."

The evidence before me, however, did not suggest that the Debtors or the special committee had done any investigation or made any careful consideration of all of the types of claims that would be covered by this sweeping language. I believe Mr. Kirpalani acknowledged that much during oral argument yesterday.

As I said yesterday, this is not a release that is tailored to claims that have actually been renewed and

passed by the Debtor. Instead, it is a release that is deliberately as broad and all-encompassing as possible untethered to any actual review of many of the claims that would be subject to the release.

I therefore do not believe that the evidence before me justifies and warrants the full scope of those releases as they were proposed, that the Debtors have since proposed to modify the terms of the proposed releases so that they will be limited to new defined term language matters that the special committee actually investigated. I may have to look at some of that language myself and will possibly have tweaks to it in the final confirmation order. But in concept, I think that complies with the comments that I made yesterday or my rulings today and that it will be acceptable.

I want to pause to reemphasize a point that came up several times during the hearing. A number of accountholders or shareholders complained during the hearing that they felt that they had been misled as to Voyager's financial condition. If a customer or shareholder believes he or she was misled or that he or she took actions that he or she otherwise would not have taken and suffered damages as a result based on any claim of misrepresentation of Voyager's financial condition, claims based on those injuries would belong to the customers or shareholders.

They would not belong to the Debtors or the estate.

The Debtor's proposed releases would release claims that the Debtors were injured due to mismanagement or bad decisions by officers or employees. The claims for injuries directly suffered by customers or shareholders, injuries that were not just derivative of injuries directly suffered by the Debtors are not affected.

The Office of the United States Trustee also objected to the scope of the proposed exculpation provision in the plan. Broadly speaking, that provision states that certain parties do not have liability for certain transactions and actions that occurred during the course of the bankruptcy case or that will occur in the implementation of a confirmed plan.

It is routine that bankruptcy plans contain provisions that state that fiduciaries and other parties do not incur liability by having engaged in transactions that the court has approved and having taken actions that the court has directed them to take.

In this case, the version of the plan that was circulated to creditors and other parties-in-interest in January, Docket Number 852, included a proposed exculpation provision that was fairly broad. It stated in relevant part that exculpated parties would have no liability or anything they had done during the course of the bankruptcy cases that

-- or anything that they would do in the course of administering the plan and further stated that they would be deemed to be in compliance with all applicable laws regarding not only the solicitation of votes, but the distribution of considerations pursuant to the plan. And therefore, an account of those distributions would not be liable at any time for violation of any applicable law, rule, or regulation governing the solicitation of acceptances or rejections of the plan or such distributions made pursuant to the plan.

I have previously issued a decision as to what I regard as the proper scope of an exculpation provision and the legal justifications for it. See In re Aegean Marine Petroleum Network Inc., 599 B.R. 717 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2019).

As I noted in Aegean, exculpation provisions are to some extent based on the theory that court-supervised fiduciaries are entitled to qualified immunity for their actions. However, a proper exculpation provision is also a protection for court-supervised and court-approved transactions. As I noted there, parties should not be liable for doing things that a court authorizes them to do and that a court decides are reasonable and appropriate things to do and in many instances that a court may direct them to do. See e.g. Airadigm Communications Inc. v. FFDD (In re Airadigm Communications Inc.), 519 F.3d 640, 655-657

(7th Cir. 2008) approving a plan provision that exculpated an entity that funded a plan from liability arising out of or in connection with the confirmation of a plan, except for willful misconduct.

In re Granite Broadcasting Corp., 369 B.R. 120, 139 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y 2007), approving an exculpation provision that was limited to conduct during the bankruptcy case and noting that the effect of the provision is to require that any claims in connection with the bankruptcy case be raised in the case and not saved for future litigation.

My reasoning in the Aegean case has been approved and adopted by other courts in other cases. See e.g. In re Latam Airlines Group S.A., 2022 Bankr. LEXIS 1725 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. June 18, 2022), In re In re Murray Metallurgical Coal Holdings, 623 B.R. 444 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 2021). Such provisions are proper to protect those who are authorized and who may be directed by the confirmation of a plan to carry out the terms of the plan. See In re Ditech Holding Corp., 2021 Bankr. LEXIS 2274 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y Aug. 20, 2021).

In this case, the Debtors and the United States

Trustee apparently had discussions, and my understanding is

that they had tentatively agreed that the proposed

exculpation language in the plan and confirmation order

would be scaled back to be more in the lines of what I ordered in the Aegean case. This became a much bigger issue, however, when at the end of last week, the Debtors filed revisions to their proposed confirmation order that included a number of paragraphs and additions to paragraphs that could have been read as barring all federal and state governmental entities and any other parties at any time from making any assertion of any kind that the Debtors, Binance U.S. or their representatives had done anything of any kind that violates any federal or state law or regulation.

It is not my intention to approve anything of that breadth, and I believe I made that clear as soon as the issue came up yesterday.

As we discussed the issue yesterday, however, the parties circled back to the proposed exculpation provisions. And certain governmental entities who previously had taken no position whatsoever and made no objection whatsoever to the original exculpation provisions suddenly took the position that as a matter of law, no exculpation provision of any kind can be granted insofar as it would relate to any federal or state statute or regulation.

As somebody put it during argument yesterday, the government's position was that any officers or directors or entities who will implement a confirmed plan just have to take their chances as to whether the government might

contend that what they're doing is illegal and even as to whether the government might seek to punish them for doing not only what I had authorized, but what I had directed them to do as a matter of the confirmed plan.

Frankly, I think this position by the government is wholly unreasonable and is based on a serious misunderstanding of just what it means when a court confirms a plan of reorganization and the legal reasons for the exculpation.

The approval of a plan of reorganization does not just give a debtor an option to proceed with what the plan provides. Instead, Section 1142(a)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code states that "The debtor and any entity organized or to be organized for the purpose of carrying out the plan shall carry out the plan and shall comply with any orders of the court." 11 U.S. Code § 1142(a)(1).

Section 1142 thereby imposes an affirmative statutory obligation on the debtors, other entities, and their personnel to do what the plan contemplates. In effect, the confirmation order acts as a court order that the plan be carried out. In this case, confirmation of the plan will require the debtors, Binance U.S. and their respective personnel and representatives, to complete the rebalancing transactions that the plan contemplates and to make the distributions of cryptocurrencies that the plan

contemplates. Once in confirm the plan, they will have no choice but to do so.

Here, all of the relevant governmental entities have been on notice of the proposed transactions. They had every opportunity to tell me if they believed that anything contemplated by the plan would violate any applicable statue, rule, or regulation. Four states have taken the position that Binance U.S. cannot open customer accounts in those states without additional approvals, and the plan specifically takes account of those objections and that No other regulators have contended during the confirmation hearing that there is anything illegal in what the plan contemplates. As noted above, the SEC has hinted vaguely that it thinks there might be issues with the Debtor's sales of VGX and/or with some unspecified aspect of Binance U.S.'s business. But the SEC has explicitly stopped short of contending that anything actually is illegal and has repeatedly declined to offer evidence or to take a more firm position on these points.

In short, what the government is requesting is that I enter a confirmation order that will have the effect under Section 1142 of the Code of compelling employees, officers, professionals, and entities to do the rebalancing transactions that the plan contemplates and to make the distributions that the plan requires while in the view of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the government those same people and entities might then be liable for fines, sanctions, damages, or other liabilities just for doing what my confirmation order affirmatively obligates them to do. And the government contends that this daunting prospect of future liability should hang over the heads of the parties and their personnel even though the government itself has had every opportunity to identify any legal issues that are posed by the transactions and is not prepared today to say that there is anything wrongful about what we are currently contemplating.

That position is absurd. If the government really wants to litigate the legality of the proposed transaction, it has been free to do so and should have done so during this hearing. Similarly, if the government truly wishes for me to make a decision today as to whether the transactions are or are not legal and to make that binding, then I will do so. But if I have to do that based on the evidence that has actually been offered to me and if I were to have to make that decision today, I would have no choice but to conclude that the transactions are perfectly legal because nobody has offered any evidence to the contrary to me.

We're not attempting to do that to the government, although I think maybe the Debtors were attempting to do that by the proposals they made at the end of last week.

We're not trying to restrict the SEC or any other

governmental entity's ability to argue in the future that the transactions that we are authorizing and directing should be stopped or prevented from going further for regulatory reasons of any kind.

However, it is entirely appropriate that I ensure that in the meantime, that the people and entities who will be directed and required by my confirmation order to complete the transactions contemplated by the plan will not themselves face liability for having already done things that I required them to do and that the government elected not to challenge at the time that requirement was imposed.

I do agree that a modification of the original exculpation provision is appropriate, and I am prepared to hold that the exculpation provision should be modified to say something along the lines of the following, recognizing that there will be some inevitable further wordsmithing and that the proposed order will reflect that wordsmithing.

What I have in mind is language to the following effect.

To the fullest extent permissible under applicable law and without affecting or limiting either the debtor release or the third-party release and except as otherwise specified in the plan, no exculpated party shall have or incur and each exculpated party is hereby exculpated from any liability for damages based on the negotiation, execution, and implementation of any transactions approved

by the Bankruptcy Court. That's the standard part of the language that essentially just says that if you have pursued a transaction that I have approved, you can't be sued later by somebody saying it was unreasonable. Any claims about the reasonableness of the transaction should have been made to me.

The proposed language would continue, in addition, the plan contemplates certain rebalancing transactions and the completion of distributions of cryptocurrencies to creditors. The exculpated party shall have no liability for and are exculpated from any claim for fines, penalties, damages, or other liabilities based on their execution and completion of the rebalancing transaction and the distributions of cryptocurrencies to creditors in the manner provided in the plan.

For the avoidance of doubt, the foregoing paragraph reflects the fact that the confirmation of the plan requires the exculpated parties to engage in certain conduct and the fact that no regulatory authority has taken the position during the confirmation hearing that such conduct actually would violate applicable laws or regulations. Nothing in this provision shall limit in any way the powers of any governmental unit to contend that any rebalancing transaction should be stopped or prevented or that any other action contemplated by the plan should be

enjoined or prevented from proceeding further, nor does anything in this provision limit the enforcement of any future regulatory or court order that requires that such activities either cease or be modified, nor does anything limit the penalties that might be applicable if such a future regulatory order is issued and violated. Similarly, nothing herein shall limit the authority of the committee on foreign investment of the United States to bar any of the contemplated transactions, nor does anything in this provision alter the terms of the plan regarding the compliance of the purchaser with applicable laws in the unsupported jurisdictions before distributions of cryptocurrencies occur in those unsupported jurisdictions.

This morning when this language was discussed, somebody asked if we could add a typical exclusion for liabilities that reflect actual fraud or willful misconduct. I don't think anybody objects to the addition of such an exclusion.

As I understand it, the government has argued that even an exculpation provision of this kind somehow amounts to a third party release that offends the principles set forth in Judge McMahon's decision in the Purdue Pharma case or that it otherwise represents an impermissible effort to interfere with the discretion of regulatory authorities or otherwise exceeds my jurisdiction.

I think most of the arguments that the government has made in that regard are complete red herrings. They pose reasons and explanations and legal justifications for what I am doing that are absolutely not the actual legal justifications for what I am doing and then rebut those irrelevant purported legal justifications.

The actual authorities on which I have relied, including my own Aegean decision and the decisions that I cited in there are not even discussed in the objections and supplemental submissions that the government authorities made to me.

I am not barring the government from trying to stop transactions from occurring. I am not barring any regulatory contention at all. I am simply saying that when the government has declined to argue that the rebalancing transaction that the plan contemplates are legal and/or the government has declined to argue that the distributions of cryptocurrencies to creditors that the plan contemplates, either through Binance, or by Voyager if the so-called toggle plan is pursued, are illegal in any way, that individuals who entities who upon confirmation will be required to engage in those activities are entitled to know that I am not thereby sentencing them to an ex post facto contention or finding that they have unknowingly and unwittingly and involuntarily incurred statutory or

regulatory liabilities for doing what I have ordered that they can do and what my confirmation order compels them to do. That is fully consistent with ordinary bankruptcy practice with the authorities that I have cited above and with basic principles of equity and estoppel. It is a fair and proper consequence of the government's own unwillingness or inability to challenge the legality of the contemplated transactions during the hearing that I have held and of the fact that I am entering an order that as a statutory matter not only approves those transactions, but actually requires them to be carried out.

I note that the government itself has conceded in the supplemental papers that it filed that many courts have considered participants in bankruptcy proceedings to be protected by a species of qualified immunity for undertaking transactions specifically approved by the bankruptcy court. I think that in effect that is all that I am doing here.

And I am not by any means preventing the enforcement of any law or regulation. Also, I am not stopping any regulatory body from stepping in and attempting to enjoin any act or transaction on any applicable regulatory ground. If the SEC or any other party believes tomorrow that it has grounds to go to court to enjoin further steps in the completion of this transaction, it is entitled to do so. I am not barring any such thing. I am simply saying that if we get six weeks

down the road and then the SEC decides to take action, that in fairness to the people who have spent six weeks doing what I have compelled them to do, those people cannot have liabilities and sanctions and penalties imposed upon them.

I also have a suggestion by the government both today and in the papers that I should simply say nothing about these issues and that if somebody is entitled to immunity of any kind for doing what I have ordered them to do, well, they can just raise that sometime in the future in some other regulatory context and we can just guess as to whether another court might agree with me or whether another court might agree that I even intended to grant such freedom to such people and that otherwise those people should just be left at risk as to what a future court might decide.

I don't see how that makes any sense at all. If
the whole idea here is that I am directing something that
gives rise to qualified immunity, I should be the one that
says what the scope of that immunity is. Not only does it
make sense for me as the court that's making the order to
give that guidance and to make that decision, the people who
are actually going to be required to do what I am compelling
are entitled to know that that's what I am doing, and they
are entitled to know that when they do what I have told them
to do, it is not subject to the risk that, as I said, that
they are being involuntarily sentenced to some sanctions for

having done so. So in that respect, I think the government's suggestion is completely off-base.

I also note that the government has taken very -have made very broad-ranged accusations that somehow this is
completely beyond my jurisdiction and completely unusual and
completely beyond my authority. I think it's completely
within my authority for the reasons that I have cited. And
I also note that that contention by the government is belied
by the literally thousands of confirmed bankruptcy plans
over the past more than 20 years I am sure that have
included similar exculpation provisions without any
complaint whatsoever by any of these same governmental
authorities. In fact, I have approved similar provisions in
my time as a bankruptcy judge and recall no objections to
them of the kind that the governmental authorities have
raised over the past two days.

I also have an objection by the State of New York to the effect that the plan allegedly provides for an unfair discrimination in the treatment of New York customers as opposed to customers in other states. The State of Texas has made a similar objection. It appears though that the Debtors and Binance U.S. have resolved a similar issue as to Vermont and possibly as to Hawaii. In any event, the State of Hawaii has not pressed any objection before me during this hearing. The gist of the New York objection is that

customers in 48 states where Binance has the required licenses may receive cryptocurrency distributions relatively quickly but that Binance and the Debtors cannot legally do the same thing in New York. Accordingly, customers in New York would have to wait until such time as Binance may obtain the necessary approvals in New York. Under the plan, if such approvals are not obtained within six months, the New York customers will receive cash distributions instead of distributions that include cryptocurrencies.

Curiously, although the State of New York and the State of Texas have filed objections, it does not appear that a single New Yorker accountholder has objected on this ground, and perhaps only one Texas accountholder. This perhaps raises a standing issue as to the State of New York, but I do not believe I need to consider that question because I believe that in any event, the objection does not have merit.

New York has asserted that the plan unfairly discriminates between customers in New York and customers in other states. Unfair discrimination technically is not really the right way to describe the objection. Section 1129(b) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that a plan may be confirmed even if not all classes have voted to accept it so long as certain conditions are met. One of those conditions is that the plan does not discriminate unfairly with respect

to each class of claim or interest that is impaired under and has not accepted the plan. Here, the relevant class is Class Three, which is made up of accountholders. That class has overwhelmingly voted to accept the plan.

I think what the state regulators really mean to argue is that the plan allegedly does not provide the same treatment to all members of Class Three as is required by Section 1123(a)(4) of the Bankruptcy Code.

I think there may have been a basis for this objection insofar as it related to the treatment of accountholders who chose not to receive cryptocurrencies and who instead wished to take cash distributions. The plan as proposed would have allowed most customers to receive cash once three months had passed and they had not affirmatively elected to be customers of Binance. Customers in the unsupported jurisdictions, however, would have had to wait six months while Binance tried to work things out with regulators even if they did not want to be Binance U.S. customers and even if they wanted cash. Binance, however, as I have noted, has agreed to change this provision and now the treatment of creditors who want cash is exactly the same in all states.

I do not otherwise believe that the objection is correct. It is quite clear that the Debtors and Binance
U.S. would like to make in-kind distributions to all

customers in all states. It is not the terms of the plan that prevent the Debtors and Binance from doing so, it is the different regulatory requirements and licenses in the different states that account for any different treatment that may occur. Or to put it another way, the plan provides in essence that the Debtors will make in-kind distributions to customers as soon as they become customers of Binance and as soon as the applicable rules and regulations in a given state permit such distributions.

However, we are not free to ignore the fact that in certain states, that cannot be accomplished as readily as in others. That does not mean that the plan is providing for different treatment of different customers, it just means that the plan itself does not have the power to sweep away the different regulations that apply in different states and does not have the power to grant licenses to Voyager and/or Binance that they do not already have.

Every customer's initial distribution rights will be determined on the effective date -- excuse me, on the same date. The different regulatory regimes in different states may mean that some customers receive distributions on different dates or in different forms, but the Debtors cannot do anything about that. The only solution to the problem New York has raised would be to force everyone in the entire country to delay their distributions until such

time as the necessary approvals are in place, if ever, to make distributions to New York customers. That would not make any sense and it is not required by any provision of the Bankruptcy Code, and the State of New York acknowledged during argument yesterday that it is not requesting such a result.

At one point I believe one of the unsupported jurisdictions argued that cryptocurrency prices can vary over time so the value of the consideration that customers receive may be different when the customers actually receive it. But that often happens under bankruptcy plans.

In the American Airlines case, for example, creditors were entitled to receive stock as distributions on their allowed claims. There were many disputed claims, however. And the people who held those claims only received stock as and when their claims were allowed.

In the Meantime, the stock price changed, sometimes very significantly. But there was no way for the debtors to control for those price changes and no practical way for any debtor to ensure that the stock that was reserved and later distributed would have the same value on every distribution date. The creditors received the same amounts of stock, which is all that the Bankruptcy Code required, and as a practical matter, the only thing that the bankruptcy could require when property other than cash is

being distributed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Similarly here, the Debtors cannot solve for the fact that cryptocurrency prices inevitably will fluctuate. The distributions that are calculated for creditors will be done on the same day and on the same basis. However, some creditors will have disputed claims and will not receive distributions until disputes are resolved. Other creditors may face delays due to regulatory issues or simply due to delays in their own submission and processing of paperwork needed to open the Binance account. It is just inevitable that some customers will actually receive distributions on different dates and that market values on those dates may fluctuate, but that does not amount to an unequal treatment proposed by the plan. I therefore overrule the objections as to the plan's treatment of customers in unsupported jurisdictions.

There were also objections that were filed as to the identity of the proposed plan administrator, Mr. Paul Hage. Many of the objections suggested that the job should not go to anyone associated with the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors or their individual members apparently because a number of accountholders are not happy with the Committee's decisions and its work.

Mr. Hage testified about his qualifications and answered questions about his work in this case and also

whether he has any conflicts of interest that would prevent him from serving as the plan administrator. He testified that he was the personal attorney to an individual who was a member of the Unsecured Creditors' Committee and that at the outset of the case he gave some advice to committee members as to how they could organize the process by which they selected a law firm to act as counsel to the committee.

A number of customers postulated that the individual who Mr. Hage represented was a close friend of Mr. Ehrlich, the CEO of the Debtors, and that this had improperly influenced the Unsecured Creditors' Committee in considering the settlement with Mr. Ehrlich that is embodied in the plan.

However, Mr. Hage testified credibly that the relevant committee member was a large customer of Voyager whose friendly relationship with Mr. Ehrlich ended when Voyager shut down its platform. Mr. Hage further testified that the relevant committee member actually spoke out against the proposed settlement when this was presented for the committees' review and that he ultimately abstained from voting after the votes of other committee members had already made clear that the creditors' committee approved of the settlement terms.

I do not believe that the evidence supports the contention that Mr. Hage's limited connections to this

committee member gave rise to conflicts of interest or that in the real world they would affect his work.

There were objections as to whether Mr. Hage should be appointed because he has never been a plan administrator before. Anybody who has extensive experience in the bankruptcy world and has represented both debtors and creditors is qualified to do the work that a plan administrator in a case such as this will be required to perform. And Mr. Hage absolutely has those qualifications in spaces.

There were also expressions of concerns by some pro se investors that I can only say amount to a desire to have more of a pit bull as a plan administrator, someone who will be absolutely more aggressive and satisfy the desires of some people for more aggressive treatment of the people who ran Voyager and more aggressive pursuit of potential litigation claims.

I understand what's behind that attitude. It does not actually in the real world translate into what makes for an effective plan administrator, or in my personal experience, what makes for an effective litigator. People who aren't lawyers sometimes think that it is the snarliest and nastiest people who are the most effective litigators. People who actually do litigation and certainly judges know that those are often the people who are the least effective

litigators. They are the most annoying and they may satisfy clients' desires to inflict pain on an adversary, but by all means they are absolutely not necessarily the most effective. So I don't think that particular criticism of Mr. Hage is well-taken and I find that he is qualified for the work and that his appointment is reasonable.

An ad hoc group of equity securityholders objected to the way the plan described the treatment of intercompany claims. I was under the impression that had been resolved until yesterday. Some additional questions were raised. I won't go into those in detail because the Debtors have now agreed and have disclosed the names of the people who will serve as independent directors of each of the separate debtor estates, and it is clear that if there is a conflict of interest between those estates, that the independent directors will have the right to appear and be heard on any issue involving where such a conflict exists. And I understand that those provisions had been included in the plan documents and that this objection is resolved.

A lot of other objections have been resolved and don't need to be discussed in detail here. The amended plan, as requested by the U.S. Trustee, has deleted provisions deeming all claims to be objected to. The proposal that the winddown debtor would have the sole authority to object to claims has been deleted. Provisions

regarding the treatment of late claims have been modified to make clear that they will be disallowed only as I so order.

Some Alameda FTX had at one point had objections, but it has dropped its objections.

The Bank of New York had an absolutely curious objection based on the odd fact that somebody apparently purported recently to transfer some real property to Voyager's name and Bank of New York has a mortgage lien on that property. That one was relatively easy to dispense with, and the confirmation order will provide Voyager is not claiming any ownership or interest in that property and that the automatic stay is no bar to the Bank of New York doing whatever it needs to do to enforce its mortgage.

I had previously indicated yesterday that I thought that the plan needed to be modified to say that -- to delete the provisions that said that the plan administrator and the Debtor do not have responsibility to try to locate people for whom checks or other communications were returned as undeliverable. Those provisions have been changed and I am satisfied with those changes.

I also said that the proposed provisions regarding professional fees had to be modified to make clear that their fees and their compliance with the provisions of the Bankruptcy Code have to continue through the effective date, not just through the confirmation date. I haven't actually

seen if those changes have been made, but I cannot imagine that they are controversial at all.

Finally, there are a few other objections that were made but that I do not believe had merit. One owner of the VGX token argued that owners of VGX are being unfairly discriminated against. This is based primarily on the fact that there is no guarantee that the VGX token will continue to be traded in a meaningful way and therefore assurance that the VGX token will continue to have much if any value.

I note that under the terms of the plan, the amount of the allowed claims that customers have based on their VGX holdings will be based on the value that VGX had on the date that the cases were commenced and not based on its current value.

However, to the extent that some of the customers' distributions will be in the form of VGX, the values of those distributions will be based on the value that VGX has on a specified date in advance of the actual distributions.

The goal is to try, if possible, to make some inkind distributions if they can be made, thereby possibly reducing tax consequences. But we have no guarantee that will work from a tax perspective.

I do not believe the Debtors are in a position to guarantee that VGX will continue to be traded any more than the Debtors can guarantee that any of the other coins that

will be distributed will continue to be traded. Similarly, the Debtors can make no guarantees about what will happen to the future values of any of the coins. Those are all things that will depend on market forces.

Customers who elect to receive in-kind

distributions instead of cash distributions will receive VGX

if they previously owned some VGX. But I don't think this

amounts to a deferential treatment or an improper

discrimination in violation of any code requirements.

The gist of the suggestion I think yesterday was that it is okay to treat other cryptocurrencies as having values based upon their market prices, but that somehow the market prices of VGX are actually illusory. Ordinarily, the market price of an asset represents the market's assessment of the potential risk and rewards associated with that asset. Even when a stock or other marketable item may appear to have little future prospect of value, it may nevertheless carry an option value based on the possibility that circumstances will occur that will lead to future Those option values or other market values are real values in the absence of proof to the contrary. And I certainly understand the objectors' worries about VGX, but I have no contrary proof here or nothing that would allow me essentially to say that the VGX token should be excluded from the distribution process and treated just as though it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

didn't exist and just as though its value was a nullity.

I have one objection to the effect that the plan does not provide for a recovery for the holders of equity at the ultimate holding company level. In fact, the plan makes clear that those equity holders will be entitled to distributions if that ultimate holding company has assets once it pays its own creditors in full, although the current predictions are that that will not happen.

I believe I have addressed all of the objections that have been filed. And for the reasons stated, I have overruled the remaining objections. I therefore will confirm the plan subject to the changes that I have described.

As to the confirmation order, there are a number of provisions that seem to me to be superfluous or repetitive or otherwise unnecessary, or in a few instances improper. And I have made substantial revisions to the proposed confirmation order. And this morning, without making any changes that would suggest how I would rule here, I gave a form of confirmation order to the Debtors that showed those other changes that I would require in the event I were to confirm the plan. There are a lot of questions and a lot of things that are in the draft order that may not necessarily work in light of other provisions that I understand are in the plan, but I'm not going to try to

Page 108 address those now. We will over the course of the next day or so try to work out the terms of the final confirmation order and any of those remaining issues will be resolved in that process. Is there anything else that anybody thinks I need to address in the course of this decision on the confirmation? MR. ARONOFF: Your Honor, this is Peter Aronoff from the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York. We had filed a letter around midday today requesting that the Court modify the provision in the confirmation order regarding the 14-day default stay (indiscernible). I know other parties have also raised that. I just wanted to (indiscernible). THE COURT: I suspect that's why Mr. Morrissey is also standing up. I'm not going to give you the 14-day stay, but I'm not going to force some poor district judge to live with the kind of schedule I've been living with over the last five days. And so I will give you a -- if we enter an order tomorrow, I will stay its effect until Monday. MR. ARONOFF: Understood, Your Honor. THE COURT: Before I say that I'm going to do that, is that going to violate some term of the Binance U.S.

deal?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 109 1 MR. SLADE: That's why I was looking at Mr. 2 Goldberg. MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, Adam Goldberg with 3 Latham & Watkins. Binance U.S.'s goal is to complete this 4 5 transaction as quickly as possible. If I could have two 6 minutes to confer with the Debtors, we could see if that's 7 an issue. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, that would -- we are 10 okay with that provision. Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. All right. 12 have another issue, but do you have a point on the 13 confirmation itself, Mr. Morrissey? 14 MR. MORRISSEY: Your Honor, on the stay issue, 15 frankly, Your Honor, I have to get back to the U.S. Trustee 16 regarding whether Monday is okay. The issue obviously is, 17 as I'm sure the people here are aware, is whether we would 18 need to request a stay pending appeal. We would all like to 19 avoid that scenario. But I have to find out whether the 20 extension until Monday will put that issue to bed, at least 21 for now. Thank you, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. Okay. I also have before 23 me a motion to appoint a trustee or motions to --24 MS. DIRESTA: Your Honor, can I ask a question 25 about the customer data?

THE COURT: Let me finish this first. Okay?

MS. DIRESTA: Okay, thank you.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: But promise I won't forget you.

I have a motion to appoint a trustee or motions to appoint a trustee and/or to remove the Unsecured Creditors'

Committee members and replace its advisors.

The Code provides that I may appoint a trustee for cause at any time before the confirmation of the plan, of course based on my decision that we are now less than a day away from the entry of an order confirming a plan. There is no way, even if I were to order the appointment of a trustee, that one would be in place before the whole issue would be moot, as the confirmation order will have been I know that's frustrating for the people who have entered. raised the motion, but I also think that while the motion makes a lot of accusations that actually have not really been answered by the Debtors, at this late stage in the case and right during the middle of the confirmation process, I can't see how the issues that were raised were of a kind that would provide cause to interrupt that process and to throw everything back into disarray. It just wouldn't have made sense to me if for reasons I said yesterday I didn't really think that there was cause at this stage of the case.

I also have two motions for returns of assets that essentially argue that customers should be allowed to take

Page 111 1 out everything that was in their accounts and shouldn't be 2 given only partial distributions as the plan contemplates. 3 I simply cannot allow that. No bankruptcy case could allow that. If one customer started doing that, it would just 4 5 mean that the next customer would get less. And the whole 6 point of the Bankruptcy Code is to make sure that everybody 7 gets equal distributions. And since there's not enough to 8 go around here, nobody can get everything that was in their 9 accounts. That's simply a basic matter of bankruptcy. So I 10 will deny those objections. 11 And you had a question about the customer 12 information? On the phone? I'm surprised I don't already -13 14 MS. DIRESTA: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: I'm surprised I don't already 16 recognize your names or your voices, but I'm afraid I don't. 17 MS. DIRESTA: Gina DiResta, Your Honor. THE COURT: Yes. 18 19 MS. DIRESTA: So I wanted to ask, my home address, 20 is that part of the level one or level two KYC that was 21 being mentioned? 22 THE COURT: Do you know the answer? 23 MS. DIRESTA: Because I want to know if my home 24 address is going to stay with Binance or not. 25 MR. GOLDBERG: Adam Goldberg of Latham & Watkins

Page 112 1 on behalf of Binance U.S., Your Honor. Home addresses would 2 be part of level one data that would be transferred. THE COURT: I'm sure that's level one. 3 MS. DIRESTA: Okay. And then what about the 4 5 biometric? You didn't mention that. 6 MR. GOLDBERG: Could you specify what you mean? 7 MS. DIRESTA: When you have to hold the phone to 8 your face and it does this biometric configuration of your 9 face and captures your data and it stores all of that. 10 MR. GOLDBERG: I mean, I would think that's part 11 of the selfies that would be available. So customers will 12 be entitled to opt out of the transfer of that data to 13 Binance U.S. 14 THE COURT: Your phone recognizes your face. 15 That's just on your phone, isn't it? 16 MR. SLADE: Yeah. I think the biometrics is an 17 Apple function, not --18 MS. DIRESTA: No, it gets sent. 19 THE COURT: It gets sent? That's news to me. 20 MS. DIRESTA: Yeah, the biometric information does 21 get sent to the company. 22 MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, we have agreed that we 23 are not acquiring selfies or this data for customers that 24 opt out. 25 THE COURT: Do you mind adding biometric data to

what you're agreeing to exclude?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So they will exclude that.

Okay. And with regard to the social MS. DIRESTA: security information. And the attorney for Binance was saying that it would be costly and it would cost \$20 per customer and there's a million customers. I just want to address the math on that. On paper, there's about 1 million customers of Voyager. I believe there's about 700,000 accounts that have under \$100. And I believe there's about 400,000 accounts that are under \$10. So those are kind of more like (indiscernible) accounts. And you can kind of see that with how many people actually participated in voting, which is under 62,000 people. And then supposedly 175,000 people have already opened accounts. There are only 2,117 people who voted no to the plan like I did. So if you assume that in a two-week opt-out period that all 2,117 people were to opt out, that only equates to \$32,340 that Binance would have to pay if you pretend that all of those people decide to turn around and open an account. So I just (indiscernible) company that deals in billions of dollars, that that's a lot of money and that that would break them. And if they think it will, I'm happy to pay the \$20 to reinstate all of my KYC information for level one in the event I ever lose my mind and decide to open a Binance

Page 114 1 account. But I just don't think when you look at it 2 mathematically there's justification for holding the social security number. I just don't think it's justified based on 3 the math. 4 5 THE COURT: Can you take that back to your client, 6 Mr. Goldberg? 7 MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, Adam Goldberg from 8 Latham & Watkins on behalf of Binance U.S. I will of course 9 take that back to my client, but I fully expect the answer 10 will be we are not making any changes to the deal that has 11 been proposed and that is supported by 97 percent of 12 customers voting. 13 MS. DIRESTA: Thank you for allowing me to speak, 14 Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. LOREN: Your Honor, this is John Loren, pro se 17 creditor. I have a few questions regarding Binance. 18 THE COURT: Just hang on. Hang on one second, Mr. 19 Loren. 20 Mr. Goldberg, I've given you a lot of these things 21 to take back. In the real world, I don't know how many 22 people will take advantage of this election that I am making 23 available and just what effect it would be or especially what effect it would be if, as the customer just suggested, 24 25 people who made the election and then wanted to be Binance

customers would have to pay you the \$20 that you say it would cost. I understand you don't want to do this and wouldn't want to do this if, you know, it would mean 700,000 potential customers are going to leave you. I find it hard to believe that that's really what we're talking about here. And it certainly makes me more comfortable if customers have the right to stop their social security information. just keep that in mind and talk to your client as a practical matter about whether it's really so important that they want to make me try to figure out what I have to do here and whether it's a small enough issue that they could just do what I've asked. Okay? MR. GOLDBERG: I understand, Your Honor. Just to give you some insight onto this issue, we sought to negotiate a way to leave behind all of this data with the Debtor. It would require a meaningful price modification per customer that opted out. And the Debtors flatly rejected that. Understandably. This is I think in the end therefore an issue of business judgement of the Debtors in selling their assets. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Mr. Loren, you had a question. MR. LOREN: That is correct, Your Honor. you for your time. I have two questions in regards to the Binance withdrawal process. There are fees to withdraw

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 116 1 crypto from Binance. Will that fee be waived for Voyager 2 users or are we expected to pay Binance to withdraw? 3 THE COURT: Does anybody here know? MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, I don't know. I think 4 all of that would be disclosed on the Binance U.S. website. 5 6 THE COURT: I don't think any of the attorneys 7 here know the answer to your question. 8 MR. LOREN: Okay. I am on the Binance website, 9 and there are fees to withdraw. So (indiscernible) pay Binance to get our money. The second question is in regards 10 11 to the daily withdrawal limit. I believe there's a limit of 12 \$5,000 U.S. Dollars per day to withdraw from Binance. Will 13 that be waived for Voyager users? Will my claim take a 14 month to get my money out of Binance? 15 MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, Adam Goldberg with 16 Latham & Watkins on behalf of Binance U.S. 17 I am being told that the limit depends upon the 18 level of KYC that a customer complies with. So if they 19 achieve the KYC two level with the additional document 20 uploads, then there would be different withdrawal limits. 21 But I would expect all of this information is available 22 through Binance U.S. website and customer service inquiries. 23 MR. LOREN: Got it. Because the website I see is 24 showing \$5,000 withdrawal per day. And that's going to take

me a month to get my money. And I have to pay them to get

25

my money, too. It's very sad.

THE COURT: Let me ask you to -- I certainly have no ability to answer this question or to deal with it. This is a practical question. Let me ask you to get in touch or ask the Debtor's counsel to get in touch with you and see if they can facilitate putting you in touch with somebody who can give you a very precise answer to your questions. Okay?

MR. LOREN: Okay. Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. SLADE: Not from us, Your Honor. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right. Yes.

MR. ARONOFF: Your Honor, it's Peter Aronoff from the U.S. Attorney's Office again. I'm trying to run some things down here, talking with several people.

Just returning to the question of the stay. You know, we were obviously trying to move as quickly as possible to try to make a decision about whether to seek an appeal. That would require some coordination from the government. And this is an issue that from my perspective only arose just within the last few days. And so we're now -- we're moving as quickly as we can, but it takes time.

I believe this is a situation where having a little more time on the stay now will lessen the need for emergency applications when it's possible wouldn't be

Page 118 1 necessary if we just have an extra few days. And so I would 2 ask that the Court --3 THE COURT: Listen, you discuss that with the 4 parties if you can work that out with the parties. If you 5 can convince them that there's some prospect that you're not 6 actually going to pursue the issue, you can look at it 7 further. I don't know, maybe you can work something out 8 with them. But in the first instance, do that. Okay? 9 MR. ARONOFF: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. Your judge is very tired 11 and he's going to --12 MR. HENDERSHOTT: Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 MR. HENDERSHOTT: Your Honor, Tracy Hendershott, 15 pro se creditor. One question and one comment if I may. 16 THE COURT: Yes. 17 MR. HENDERSHOTT: The question is actually for pro 18 se creditor Lisa Trevino, who has had to focus on her day 19 job today. And she asked me to just put into the record if 20 there was any follow-up with her action to getting data back 21 that she requested from the Debtors. Your Honor, once this 22 confirmation is done today, she wasn't sure if she was able 23 to engage with you any further to follow up on that. So I committed to her I would ask that in the hearing on her 24 25 behalf.

Page 119 1 MS. OKIKE: Your Honor, Christine Okike on behalf 2 of Kirkland & Ellis. We will provide her with the data. And if she needs an extension of the deadline with respect 3 to the merit objection, we'll allow for that. 4 5 THE COURT: Very good. 6 MR. HENDERSHOTT: Thank you. I will relay that to 7 her. Thank you both. 8 And then just one comment. I did want to clarify, 9 Your Honor, your interpretation of our request for having a 10 third party (indiscernible) -- I'm drawing a blank. 11 tired. We're all tried -- for the winddown trustee. We 12 weren't looking for a snarling bit pull, Your Honor. We 13 were looking for effectiveness. You've seen the UCC go 14 along with every single exception and (indiscernible) all 15 along we just didn't have confidence that there would be a 16 level of (indiscernible), which is different. Effectiveness 17 is different than a snarling pit bull. I just wanted to 18 clarify that. 19 THE COURT: All right. 20 MR. HENDERSHOTT: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Well, if that's true, maybe I'll 22 delete that part of my discussion and commentary from the 23 final version of the decision. 24 MR. HENDERSHOTT: Thank you, Judge. 25 I thought I understood it differently. THE COURT:

	Page 120
1	But thank you for the clarification.
2	MS. OKIKE: Your Honor, on behalf of the Debtors,
3	we just want to thank you for taking extensive time to
4	really help us navigate through very complex and challenging
5	issues. So we really appreciate it.
6	THE COURT: okay.
7	MR. GOLDBERG: Gratitude to Your Honor and all of
8	your staff and chambers. Thank you. The Committee thanks
9	you as well.
10	THE COURT: Thank you all for your submissions,
11	and we are adjourned.
12	(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at
13	5:14 PM)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

		P	age 121
1	INDEX		
2			
3	RULINGS		
4		Page	Line
5	Amended Plan Confirmed	107	12
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	Page 122
1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing
4	transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.
5	
6	Soneya M. deslarshi Hyd-
7	
8	Sonya Ledanski Hyde
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Veritext Legal Solutions
21	330 Old Country Road
22	Suite 300
23	Mineola, NY 11501
24	
25	Date: March 10, 2023

[& - 97]

	T		
&	<b>11501</b> 122:23	84:14,15	<b>477</b> 59:10
<b>&amp;</b> 3:3,17 5:8,15	<b>118</b> 34:12	<b>2023</b> 1:15 18:3	<b>478</b> 78:12
65:6 109:4	<b>12</b> 121:5	18:4,7 54:6,9	<b>48</b> 96:1
111:25 114:8	<b>120</b> 84:5	55:21 57:21	<b>482</b> 59:10
116:16 119:2	<b>12151</b> 122:6	72:21 73:17	5
1	<b>1271</b> 3:5	122:25	<b>5,000</b> 116:12
	<b>12th</b> 4:18	<b>20549</b> 4:12	116:24
1 8:18,21 9:5,9	<b>139</b> 84:6	<b>22-10943</b> 1:3	<b>51</b> 3:12
10:20 11:7,13	<b>14</b> 34:14 71:8	<b>2274</b> 84:20	<b>519</b> 83:25
11:20 12:7,25	108:13,17	<b>23</b> 55:21	<b>599</b> 83:14
13:20,23 14:10	<b>140</b> 73:13	<b>28</b> 57:21	<b>5:14</b> 120:13
14:22 15:15,18	<b>1725</b> 84:14	<b>2:10</b> 1:16	
16:6,18 17:11	<b>175,000</b> 113:14	<b>2d</b> 78:12	6
17:14 18:4,7	<b>18</b> 8:6 18:3	<b>2nd</b> 23:7	<b>6</b> 37:8
22:10 86:12,16	84:15	3	<b>601</b> 3:19
113:8	<b>1850</b> 4:18	<b>3</b> 33:5,14,20	<b>61</b> 19:9
10 77:12,14	<b>198</b> 73:12	34:6,8	<b>62</b> 19:9
113:11 122:25	2	<b>300</b> 122:22	<b>62,000</b> 113:14
<b>100</b> 4:11 56:21	<b>2</b> 29:5,7 33:24	<b>3020</b> 34:11	<b>623</b> 84:16
58:18 71:16	37:8	<b>32,340</b> 113:18	<b>640</b> 83:25
113:10	<b>2,117</b> 113:15	<b>330</b> 122:21	<b>655-657</b> 83:25
<b>10004</b> 1:13 4:4	113:17	<b>34</b> 56:17	7
10007 5:4	<b>20</b> 9:12 34:15	<b>36</b> 56:17	7 1:15 71:3,9
<b>10010</b> 3:13	66:9 70:20	<b>369</b> 84:5	74:1,10,14,18
<b>10017</b> 5:11	84:20 95:10	<b>3:00</b> 33:19	<b>700,000</b> 113:9
<b>10020</b> 3:6	113:6,23 115:1	69:19	115:3
<b>10022</b> 3:20	<b>2000</b> 8:6	3rd 5:3 23:7	<b>717</b> 83:14
<b>10036</b> 5:18	<b>2000</b> 8.6 <b>20036</b> 4:19		7th 84:1
<b>107</b> 121:5	<b>20036</b> 4:19 <b>2007</b> 78:13	4	8
<b>11</b> 49:15 50:1	84:6	<b>4</b> 61:19 97:8	
50:25 86:16		<b>400</b> 74:9	<b>852</b> 82:22
<b>1114</b> 5:17	<b>2008</b> 84:1	<b>400,000</b> 113:11	86 5:3
<b>1123</b> 97:8	<b>2011</b> 59:10	<b>444</b> 84:16	<b>863</b> 73:13
<b>1129</b> 49:15	<b>2019</b> 83:14	<b>452</b> 78:12	9
50:1,25 96:22	<b>2021</b> 84:16,20	<b>453</b> 59:9	<b>90</b> 71:5
<b>1142</b> 86:12,16	84:21	<b>462</b> 78:12	<b>97</b> 114:11
86:17 87:22	<b>2022</b> 46:21		
	53:20 54:1,3		

[abide - adam] Page 2

	acceptable	accusation	46:16 48:24
a	81:15	42:24	49:1 91:4
abide 37:25	acceptances	accusations	92:22
38:3	83:9	42:18 43:4	activity 52:4
abided 34:15	accepted 97:2	95:4 110:16	acts 86:20
abilities 68:12	access 46:21	achieve 116:19	actual 10:5,11
ability 9:20	accomplished	achieved 57:7	30:4,12 31:22
11:1 38:18	30:11 98:11	acknowledge	37:6 42:2,23
66:16 67:22	account 8:2,12	18:14	43:12 47:15
89:1 117:3	11:4,6,11 13:3	acknowledged	51:24 72:8,8
able 22:17	56:16 61:7	80:22 99:4	78:23 80:17
31:11 32:19	64:10,21 66:23		81:3 91:16
54:9 58:1 62:7	67:3,4,10,11	acknowledges 26:20	92:4,7 105:18
62:10 64:8	68:16 69:1	acquire 12:11	actually 11:11
67:24 74:24,24	70:13 83:6	acquired 8:3	12:3,25 13:2
118:22	87:10 98:4	14:10 66:4	23:16 27:18
<b>above</b> 70:6,15	100:10 113:20	acquiring	30:11 41:23,23
87:13 93:4	114:1	66:14 112:23	42:6,10 44:6
absence 11:16	accountholder	act 80:14 93:20	44:10 51:20
58:22 106:21	96:12,13	101:7	56:9 58:23
absolute 43:2	accountholders	acting 26:13	59:21 64:4
absolutely	37:12 38:10,18	48:22 60:18	68:21 70:5,15
13:18 15:11	38:20 42:15	action 20:17	74:2 77:6
16:1 25:24	50:17 54:12	26:5 31:13,21	80:25 81:10
26:25 30:3	56:15 60:18,24	48:14,16,17	87:17 88:18
31:3 42:23	61:22 62:14	49:6 50:4	90:21 93:10
59:18 92:4	70:8 81:18	79:19 90:25	94:21 99:10
102:9,14 103:3	97:3,11 100:22	94:1 118:20	100:11 101:18
104:5	accounts 38:9	actions 9:14	102:19,24
abstained	64:3 68:22,25	28:23 29:12	104:25 106:13
101:20	87:8 111:1,9	40:20,22 41:1	110:16 113:13
absurd 22:5	113:10,11,12	41:2 48:13	118:6,17
56:7 88:11	113:10,11,12	81:21 82:12,18	ad 5:16 7:8
abundantly	accurate 55:7	83:18	103:7
29:20	55:9 122:4	activities 10:15	adam 3:8
accept 96:23		20:21 29:23	34:20 65:6
97:4	accurately 43:8	43:23,24 45:6	109:3 111:25
	J.0	73.23,27 43.0	107.3 111.23

114:7 116:15	administrative	affecting 19:15	ahead 13:25
<b>add</b> 91:15	46:25 74:9,13	89:20	17:24 23:20
<b>added</b> 73:16	administrator	affiliated 42:19	26:2 28:10
adding 15:3	100:18 101:2	affiliates 79:14	65:3
112:25	102:5,8,13,20	affirmative	airadigm 83:24
addition 13:24	104:17	26:25 29:14	83:25
15:20 19:25	admissible	75:11 86:17	airlines 84:14
28:24 49:11	42:24 51:25	affirmatively	99:12
50:6 73:18	59:18	10:7 16:24	alameda 73:9
75:4 90:7	admitted 57:19	44:24 75:17	74:9,11,12
91:17	<b>adopt</b> 40:18	88:3 97:14	104:3
additional	adopted 84:13	<b>afraid</b> 111:16	alexander 4:3
12:22 14:8,23	advance 9:3	afternoon	alignment
14:24 35:14	12:4 13:19	28:11 35:5	66:11
53:4 55:2 65:1	105:18	agencies 51:14	allegedly 45:2
65:9,25 69:11	advanced	<b>agent</b> 60:19	49:5 52:16
70:16 77:13,23	65:17,20	aggressive	73:8 77:12
87:9 103:10	advantage	102:14,15,16	95:18 97:6
116:19	114:22	<b>ago</b> 13:1	<b>allow</b> 16:14
additions 85:5	adversary	<b>agree</b> 9:13 35:2	26:24 65:23
address 13:13	103:2	40:6 77:8	80:1 106:23
17:12 18:2	adversely 39:6	89:12 94:11,12	111:3,3 119:4
43:13 47:17,20	41:8	agreed 9:11	allowed 26:6
48:8 51:23	advice 29:18	14:12 61:12,14	97:13 99:14,16
60:13 62:5	101:5	62:25 64:7	105:11 110:25
65:16 108:1,6	advisors 79:11	65:19 68:14	allowing
111:19,24	110:6	70:16 75:2	114:13
113:8	aegean 83:13	84:24 97:20	allows 13:6
addressed	83:15 84:12	103:12 112:22	alter 21:2
107:9	85:2 92:8	agreeing 113:1	91:10
addresses 8:21	affect 39:6	agreement	alternative
112:1	41:3 48:18	17:22 63:3,8	30:20 71:2
adequate 72:18	49:25 50:8	68:2 80:14	alternatives
adjourned	60:12 74:16	agreements	39:2
120:11	102:2	7:21	amazon 57:3
administering	affected 41:9	agrees 69:18	amended
83:2	73:11 82:7		103:21 121:5

america 5:2	anyway 29:24	applied 40:11	89:25 90:3
american	<b>apa</b> 18:1,15,16	applies 11:8	93:16 95:13
99:12	18:18	<b>apply</b> 73:4	101:22
americas 3:5	<b>apart</b> 32:24	98:15	approves 93:10
5:17	70:20	<b>appoint</b> 109:23	approving 51:8
<b>amount</b> 37:14	apologize	110:4,5,7	84:1,6
100:13 102:12	23:21 65:4	appointed	approximately
105:11	apparent 41:16	102:4	71:5,7,16
amounts 39:3	58:7	appointment	april 18:4,7
91:20 99:23	apparently	103:6 110:11	architects
106:8	38:21 43:5	appreciate	44:17
analysis 70:24	45:25 53:21	22:24 37:17	aren't 21:22
analytics 16:7	84:23 100:21	38:4 48:11	102:22
16:11	104:6	51:2 68:7	<b>argue</b> 46:15
announce	<b>appeal</b> 109:18	120:5	89:1 92:15,17
33:12 35:9,25	117:19	appropriate	97:6 110:25
announced	appear 96:11	22:7 23:5,17	argued 38:14
40:24	103:16 106:17	25:12 26:10	38:24 39:2
annoying	appeared	60:9 83:22	43:15,17 54:25
103:1	78:18 79:10	89:5,13	63:5 91:19
answer 49:2,10	appears 61:19	approval 22:2	99:8 105:5
111:22 114:9	73:19 95:21	38:6 63:11	argument
116:7 117:3,7	<b>apple</b> 112:17	72:20 75:24	21:22 37:10
answered	apples 74:7	86:10	46:19 49:11
100:25 110:17	applicable	approvals 53:4	72:8 73:14
answering	19:15 20:13,22	53:10,11 62:10	80:23 85:22
69:22	21:4 22:7	62:12 87:9	99:5
anticipate 55:1	51:12 53:1	96:6,7 99:1	arguments
anxious 47:12	58:5 70:13	approve 35:22	27:25 47:24
anybody 22:6	77:16,19 83:3	47:13 48:19	72:5 92:1
29:19 31:4	83:7 87:6	85:11	arising 80:6
32:13 33:23	89:19 90:21	approved	84:2
34:2,5 91:17	91:5,11 93:21	19:21 26:22	arm's 78:2
102:5 108:5	98:8	31:24 32:10	aronoff 4:6
116:3	applications	56:3 73:18	108:8,8,22
anybody's 43:7	117:25	78:16 82:18	117:13,13
		83:19 84:12	118:9

	1	T	
<b>arose</b> 117:21	57:1,6,22,24	attorneys 3:4	112:11 114:23
arrangement	57:25 58:1,3	3:11,18 4:2,10	116:21
59:3 60:11,24	59:16,20 60:16	4:16,17 5:2,9	avenue 3:5,12
arrangements	60:21,22,23	5:16 37:18	3:19 5:10,17
16:25 63:6	61:1,6,15,19	44:15 116:6	<b>avoid</b> 10:10
80:11	70:11,11 71:16	attorney's	109:19
arrest 26:4	77:5,10 107:6	22:17 108:9	avoidance 20:8
arrows 41:9	110:24 115:20	aug 84:20	90:16
76:22 77:7	assist 76:18	august 54:3	avoiding 13:9
78:6	associated	authorities	aware 26:8
arrows' 41:10	100:20 106:15	17:17 21:12	35:10,11 39:18
article 61:19	association	22:7,8 53:16	39:25 42:1
articles 42:17	4:16	91:24 92:7,10	50:2 109:17
asked 45:9,10	assume 24:1	93:4 95:13,15	azman 5:13
48:19,20,23	113:17	authority	24:16,16,20
57:13 60:9	assuming 18:7	20:11,25 26:5	25:1,4 26:2,3
61:21 63:17,24	assumptions	26:16 28:7	26:25 27:5
91:15 115:12	71:18,19	29:23 30:16	b
118:19	assurance	59:6 75:11	<b>b</b> 1:21 49:23
asking 36:21	105:8	77:16 90:19	96:22
aspect 30:8	assurances	91:7 95:6,7	<b>b.r.</b> 59:9 83:14
31:24 87:15	23:13 54:23	103:25	84:5,16
aspects 30:7	55:3,18,23	authorized	back 15:7 17:8
45:18 47:23	56:19 57:12	46:6 84:17	18:3 19:25
assault 40:23	58:14 70:16	86:3	35:11,15 68:10
asserted 77:21	assure 55:12	authorizes	69:11 85:1,15
77:22,24 79:20	attached 70:24	83:21	109:15 110:21
79:24 96:18	attempting	authorizing	114:5,9,21
assertion 85:8	88:22,23 93:20	18:16 27:16	118:20
assessment	attention 51:13	89:2	backdrop
106:14	attesting 57:8	automatic	39:23
asset 57:3	attitude 102:18	104:12	background
106:14,16	attorney 33:24	automatically	39:15
assets 41:16,24	101:3 113:5	64:17	<b>backup</b> 38:11
42:3,4,11,25	attorney's 5:1	available 39:1	bad 82:4
46:22 54:24	117:14	62:22 71:6	balance 17:7
56:22,24,25		72:9,14 77:4	Dalance 17.7

<b>bank</b> 8:1,2,12	<b>base</b> 95:2	behavior 42:2	<b>best</b> 40:2
8:12 11:4,4	<b>based</b> 10:24	belated 73:2	<b>better</b> 54:23
64:3,10,10	16:23 19:19	belied 28:1	68:18 74:17
68:16,16 104:5	20:5 28:7	95:8	<b>beyond</b> 95:5,6
104:8,12	30:12 37:1	beliefs 46:8	<b>big</b> 14:21
<b>bankr</b> 59:10	51:24 59:13	believe 18:24	bigger 85:2
83:14 84:6,14	65:21 71:19	19:12 25:22	billions 113:21
84:14,16,20,20	74:7,21 80:5	51:15 54:5	binance 15:1
bankruptcy	81:23,24 83:16	55:7 60:3	16:4 17:6
1:1,11,23 26:5	86:6 88:17	70:14 71:4	33:25 38:16
26:10 27:2,14	89:24 90:12	75:19 76:24,25	60:10,14,17,18
27:25 28:2,8	104:6 105:6,11	80:22 81:5	60:20,25 61:1
29:25 39:10,24	105:12,13,17	85:12 96:15,16	61:5,12,16,18
41:11,21 46:20	106:12,18	97:23 99:7	61:24 62:2,9
46:23 49:14,15	110:9 114:3	101:24 105:4	62:11,15,25
51:1 58:24	bases 46:8	105:23 107:9	63:5,11,13,14
59:1,5 75:6,10	48:15 57:17	113:9,10 115:5	63:16,20,20,22
77:13 82:13,15	<b>basic</b> 31:23	116:11 117:23	63:25 64:5,12
82:25 84:7,9	65:15,24 93:5	<b>believed</b> 60:11	64:17,18,19,22
86:12 90:1	111:9	71:11 87:5	65:7,19,23
93:3,14,16	basically 19:2	believes 28:19	66:7,13,23,24
95:9,14 96:22	32:7	45:17,20,25	67:6 68:13,18
97:8 99:4,11	basis 8:22	47:10 51:10	68:22,23,24
99:23,25 102:6	27:17 43:9	72:6 81:20	69:3,4,9,18
104:24 111:3,6	45:11 57:23	93:22	70:7,9,20,21
111:9	72:17 97:9	belong 81:25	70:21 71:1,5
<b>bar</b> 21:1 27:2	100:5	82:1	71:11,15 72:2
91:8 104:12	<b>bear</b> 10:1,4	beneficial	72:24 74:25
bargaining	<b>bed</b> 109:20	60:21 61:6,18	85:8 86:22
78:2	began 37:7	70:10	87:8,16 92:19
barnea 5:6	beginning 30:4	beneficiaries	95:22 96:1,3,5
22:16,16 25:11	behalf 7:23	79:7	97:15,17,18,19
25:11 29:13	35:6 46:2 65:7	benefit 13:5	97:24 98:2,7
barring 85:6	79:20 112:1	56:15	98:17 100:10
92:12,13 93:24	114:8 116:16	benefits 38:20	108:24 109:4
bars 46:11	118:25 119:1	38:23 70:19	111:24 112:1
	120:2	71:11 78:1	112:13 113:5

[binance - cash] Page 7

113:19,25	biometrics	119:17	capability
114:8,17,25	112:16	<b>bunch</b> 21:11	52:11
115:25 116:1,2	<b>birth</b> 65:16	<b>burden</b> 43:18	capacities 70:5
116:5,8,10,12	<b>bit</b> 13:17 17:4	44:9	capacity 56:14
116:14,16,22	23:16 119:12	bureau 65:13	57:23 79:14,25
binance.us 3:4	<b>blank</b> 119:10	business 30:9	capital 56:23
9:13,19,23	bodies 52:25	42:2,19,20	80:6
10:6,15 11:22	<b>body</b> 93:20	50:10 52:22	captures 112:9
13:6 16:10	borders 59:9	55:16 57:14	careful 80:20
30:9 38:9,12	<b>bowling</b> 1:12	59:2,2,9,17,22	carried 31:24
38:15,16,17,25	brakes 31:8	60:5,12 63:16	86:21 93:11
39:3 40:1 41:6	breach 18:17	66:19 68:1	<b>carry</b> 84:19
42:19,25 44:4	breaches 18:10	77:22 80:10	86:15 106:18
44:6,10,21,25	breadth 85:12	87:16 115:19	carrying 86:14
45:21 46:16	<b>break</b> 59:25	<b>busy</b> 13:4	case 1:3 7:4
48:2,4,21,24	113:22	<b>buy</b> 68:3	27:25 37:15
48:25 49:7,24	breakage 14:3	buyers 58:21	39:7,16,21,24
50:10,13,20	<b>brief</b> 59:25,25	<b>buying</b> 63:23	41:19 42:8,15
52:4,11,13,21	<b>bring</b> 23:12	bylaws 77:25	46:20,23 47:5
54:23 55:16	34:21 51:13	c	50:11 66:11
56:11,13,16,19	56:5	<b>c</b> 3:1 4:7 7:1	75:10,13 77:19
56:19,21,24	bringing 15:19	61:19 73:12	82:13,20 84:8
57:1,2,5,13,15	<b>broad</b> 79:5,17	122:1,1	84:10,10,12,22
57:21,24 58:1	81:2 82:23	calculated	85:2 86:21
58:2,3,15,16	95:4	100:4	91:22 99:12
59:19	broadcasting	calculations	100:25 101:5
binance.us.	84:5	71:10,14,18	102:8 110:17
9:11 10:11	broader 25:7	called 50:12	110:23 111:3
13:24 34:21	29:3	52:20 61:23	caselaw 77:20
38:11 39:14	broadly 82:10	71:17 92:19	<b>cases</b> 11:14
43:10 50:15	<b>broker</b> 44:5,8	calls 30:13	28:8,20 37:17
54:13,20 58:9	48:2,23 49:24	camera 45:11	40:10 46:23
binance.us'	52:5	cancel 68:4	59:10 79:11
45:6	brokers 40:3	can't 19:23	82:25 84:13
binding 88:16	44:22	21:21 25:22	105:13
biometric	<b>bull</b> 10:2,2	28:1 34:1 90:3	cash 10:11
112:5,8,20,25	66:8 102:13	110:19	13:24 38:19
		110.17	

[cash - clear] Page 8

			11512
62:3,4,11,16	certified 122:3	chats 8:23	116:13
62:19,23 96:8	cetera 64:4	check 11:24	claiming
97:12,13,19,21	cftc 40:8,23	12:22 13:23	104:11
99:25 106:6	54:2	14:2,9,19	claims 74:23
cast 58:16	challenge	checks 12:5,10	75:2,15 76:6
category 15:19	89:11 93:7	13:7 65:11	76:13,16,20,20
15:21 16:6	challenges 76:5	104:18	76:23,25 77:5
<b>cause</b> 79:19	challenging	<b>chief</b> 76:14	77:6,8,20 78:7
110:8,20,23	120:4	choice 21:17	79:6 80:21,25
causes 31:21	chambers 5:3	25:20 75:9	81:3,24 82:3,4
<b>cease</b> 18:11	36:23 120:8	87:2 88:19	84:9 90:4
20:21 91:4	chance 30:21	choose 61:2	99:14,14,15,16
celsius 42:2,7	37:21 64:11	63:19	100:6 102:17
<b>ceo</b> 76:13	chances 85:25	chose 75:6	103:9,23,25
101:10	change 18:1	97:11	104:1 105:11
certain 18:1	61:13,21 63:1	christine 3:22	clarification
20:1,11 48:24	63:1 66:9	7:22 35:1	45:9 120:1
52:21 57:14	76:10 97:20	119:1	clarifications
60:10 71:20	changed 15:7	<b>cip</b> 65:12	45:24
72:2 75:22	16:5 99:17	cir 78:12 84:1	clarified 60:15
76:16 77:24	104:20	circled 85:15	clarify 24:18
82:11,11 85:16	changes 12:19	circuit 77:16	119:8,18
90:8,18 96:24	35:19 36:5	circulated 54:6	clarity 27:13
98:11	50:16 60:10	82:21	class 97:1,2,3,3
certainly 12:22	99:19 104:20	circumstances	97:7
14:23 17:2	105:1 107:12	10:25 106:19	classes 96:23
22:19 25:12	107:19,21	citations 37:2	clear 25:4
28:13 29:14	114:10	78:13	29:20 30:3
39:23 41:17	chapter 71:3,9	<b>cited</b> 59:10	37:4 38:21
42:5,8 43:7	74:1,10,14,18	92:9 93:4 95:7	55:15 65:24
46:3 58:21	characterize	civil 25:7	66:16 70:4,6
102:24 106:22	55:8	claim 20:4	74:22 75:8
115:6 117:2	characterized	31:11,20 74:10	77:16 85:12
certificate	40:15,16	74:11,13,13	97:24 101:22
57:16,19	charge 76:16	78:6 79:21,23	103:14 104:2
certifications	<b>chase</b> 15:4 16:2	80:3,9 81:23	104:22 107:5
57:8		90:11 97:1	

clearance 46:5	come 13:24	committees'	complaint
65:25	15:7 28:14	101:20	72:25 95:12
clearer 40:5	29:25 31:11	committee's	complaints
clearly 38:2	67:24 77:9	100:23	55:6,11
60:16	comes 39:17	commodities	complete 27:24
clears 69:22	comfortable	40:7	52:9 54:23
client 12:8	115:6	commodity	56:20 70:9
16:20 17:14	commenced	9:15	86:23 89:8
33:6,20 65:8	105:13	<b>common</b> 39:10	92:2 109:4
69:12 114:5,9	comment 25:1	communicati	completed
115:8	118:15 119:8	83:24,25	38:13 56:13
clients' 103:2	commentary	104:18	completely
close 18:6	119:22	companies	28:1,6 30:7
38:12 68:22	comments	42:19	38:21 67:19
101:9	24:17 38:16	company 9:19	95:2,5,5,6,6
closer 22:25	47:20 65:22	10:12 53:23	completeness
closes 55:13	72:22 81:13	107:4,6 112:21	74:3
66:23	commission	113:21	completing
<b>closing</b> 18:7,9	4:9,10 43:14	company's	13:23
18:14	45:19,22 46:1	57:24	completion 7:3
coal 84:16	75:20	compared 71:8	20:2,6 53:5
code 30:1	<b>commit</b> 26:12	71:9 74:8,10	62:24 90:9,13
49:15 51:1	committed	comparison	93:23
59:1,5 86:13	118:24	37:16 74:7	complex 120:4
86:16 87:22	committee	compel 21:20	compliance
96:22 97:8	3:11 5:9 7:9	27:12	21:3,11 57:8
99:4,23 104:24	20:25 24:17	compelled	83:3 91:11
106:9 110:7	35:7 76:17,19	27:15 94:3	104:23
111:6	76:22 77:1,2	compelling	complicating
coincidence	78:9,10,11	87:22 94:21	41:5
66:11	79:8 80:19	compels 93:2	complies 59:1
coins 105:25	81:10 91:7	competency	81:13 116:18
106:3	100:20 101:4,5	78:8	comply 58:5
collapse 41:12	101:7,11,15,18	complained	59:5 86:15
colloquial 14:4	101:21,22	70:18 73:7,20	conceded
combined	102:1 110:6	73:22,23 81:18	93:12
22:20	120:8		

concept 35:21	confer 17:14	110:10	constant 55:16
39:19 81:13	109:6	confirms 86:7	constitute
concern 32:3	confidence	conflict 103:14	31:25 43:19
32:16 68:20	119:15	103:17	46:3,3
concerns 22:18	configuration	conflicts 101:1	consulted 65:8
22:22 23:9	112:8	102:1	consummation
31:5 53:18	confirm 21:15	congress 40:18	53:9,12
60:13 64:6	30:1 35:9	connection	contact 17:2
102:11	49:16 87:1	84:3,9	64:1
conclude 48:13	107:12,22	connections	contain 43:25
59:21 60:4	confirmation	101:25	82:15
78:14,25 88:20	7:3 18:18 19:1	consensual	contains 72:4
concluded	19:8 20:9,12	75:24,25 76:3	contemplated
76:19,23	32:24 33:11	consent 57:15	20:17 21:1
120:12	36:12 38:7	75:12	50:23 51:18
conclusion	46:11 49:17	consequence	52:7 53:2,5,13
50:3 59:19	51:6 69:15	93:6	87:6 89:8
72:25 74:17	81:12 84:3,18	consequences	90:25 91:9
conclusions	84:25 85:4	48:21 105:21	93:7
36:17 54:20	86:20,21 87:12	consider 21:10	contemplates
57:18	87:21 88:3	30:4 36:12,14	20:1 29:21
conclusory	89:7 90:17,20	47:12 60:10	36:15 86:19,24
54:10	92:21 93:2	61:21 96:15	87:1,13,24
condition	104:10,25	consideration	90:8 92:16,18
18:14 81:20,24	107:14,18,20	80:20 99:9	111:2
conditional	108:2,7,13	considerations	contemplating
51:4	109:13 110:8	83:5	88:10
conditions 18:7	110:13,18	considered	contend 20:15
18:9 71:20	118:22	47:18 52:3	86:1 90:23
96:24,24	confirmed 28:2	77:20 93:14	contended
conduct 10:7	44:23 46:6	considering	44:18 53:16
10:16 11:23	47:4 60:25	59:12 77:15,18	54:18 71:25
20:11,13 38:1	82:14 85:24	78:14 101:12	73:14 87:11
84:7 90:19,21	86:4 95:9	consistent	contending
conducted 42:2	96:23 121:5	28:17 77:19	44:24 87:17
57:17	confirming	93:3	contends 46:11
	27:19 30:15		88:4

contention	convinced	82:12,25 83:1	83:19,19,21,22
46:13 52:1,6	16:21 69:4	108:1,6 110:9	83:23 86:7,16
63:7 70:3	coordination	114:8	86:20 90:1
72:10 92:14,24	117:19	<b>court</b> 1:1,11	91:3 93:16,23
95:8 101:25	<b>copy</b> 32:20,20	2:1 7:2,8,12,17	94:11,12,14,19
contentions	cordry 4:21	8:7,11,14,17	108:12,16,23
46:5 52:15	23:1,1 31:16	8:20,25 9:8	109:8,11,22
context 9:10	31:16 32:15	10:18 11:3,10	110:1,3 111:15
32:10 43:11	corp 84:5,20	11:15,25 12:15	111:18,22
67:21 94:10	correct 7:7	13:11,21 14:5	112:3,14,19,25
contexts 74:14	34:6 37:2	14:14 15:3,16	113:3 114:5,15
74:16	58:19 61:16	15:22 16:13,21	114:18 115:21
continue 55:17	97:24 115:23	17:13,15,20,24	116:3,6 117:2
59:24 61:6	corrected 37:5	18:5,12,20	117:9,12 118:2
90:7 104:24	corresponding	19:10,21 20:20	118:3,10,13,16
105:7,9,24	28:21	20:23 22:1,15	119:5,19,21,25
106:1	<b>cost</b> 10:6 13:9	23:18,20,23	120:6,10
continued 37:8	65:25 66:9	24:3,5,11,13	<b>courts</b> 26:21
37:9	113:6 115:2	24:19,21 25:3	84:13 93:13
continues 41:6	<b>costly</b> 113:6	25:10,12,15	<b>court's</b> 28:13
continuing	couldn't 8:7	26:6,10,10,14	29:2
74:2	16:15 30:7	26:16,18,23	coverage 77:14
contract 62:1	50:21	27:2,3,6,14,23	covered 80:21
contractual	could've 21:24	27:24 29:8,17	<b>craft</b> 22:13
80:10	49:8	32:12,17 33:2	create 67:10
contrary 53:16	counsel 29:12	33:8,16,23	credible 71:23
63:7 71:23	29:19 48:20	34:1,2,7,10,17	credibly
88:21 106:21	68:21 76:17	34:23 35:8,13	101:14
106:23	78:8 101:7	35:17,21,25	credited 61:7
control 68:13	117:5	36:7,9,11 37:6	creditor 5:23
99:19	country 41:11	37:23 46:13	6:2,5 66:20
controversial	98:25 122:21	49:16 51:5,22	73:9 75:15
105:2	couple 9:5	60:2 65:3	114:17 118:15
conversations	<b>course</b> 12:10	66:21 67:5,12	118:18
55:22	31:4 36:11	68:7,10 69:15	creditors 19:22
convince 16:23	37:5,20 58:17	69:20 80:12	20:3,7 36:15
118:5	60:9 71:19	82:18,19 83:16	37:16 46:21

			T.
47:1 71:7 75:4	48:4 96:2 99:8	101:15 109:25	customer's
75:7 78:10,11	100:3	111:4,5,11	9:14 16:17
79:9 82:21	curious 104:5	113:7 114:24	61:7 98:18
90:10,14 92:18	curiously	115:17 116:18	d
97:21 99:13,22	96:10	116:22	<b>d</b> 7:1 121:1
100:4,6,7,21	current 40:14	customers 7:19	daily 116:11
102:7 107:7	66:1 67:10	7:20,25 9:13	damages 19:19
creditors' 71:1	71:15 105:14	11:8 12:10,13	20:5 23:13
73:23,25 101:4	107:7	14:13,25 38:10	25:6,8 81:22
101:11,22	currently 40:1	41:25 42:11	88:2 89:24
110:5	41:21 88:10	46:21 54:13	90:12
<b>crime</b> 26:12	custodial 56:14	56:12,23 57:22	dare 26:1
<b>crimes</b> 65:13	57:23	61:1,8,17,25	darren 5:13
criminal 25:7	custodied 42:5	62:1,2,6,8,16	24:16
25:13 26:6,11	custody 42:3	62:17,18,20,22	data 7:18,19
26:17	60:23 61:17	63:10,11,15,15	9:9,16,20
criteria 40:10	70:12	63:19,20,24	10:12,14 11:18
criticism 103:4	custom 4:3	64:7,15 65:24	16:7,8,10,15
<b>cross</b> 58:9	customer 7:18	66:10 67:6	63:4,6,9,13,14
crying 15:25	8:23 9:2,9,21	68:12,15,21,24	63:25 66:3,24
crypto 13:1	9:22 11:18,21	69:6 70:17	69:6 109:25
66:8 116:1	12:6,18 13:13	72:7,9,15	112:2,9,12,23
cryptocurren	14:4,8,9,16,19	75:22 81:25	112:25 115:15
20:3,7 21:5	14:24 17:5,6,6	82:5 95:19,20	118:20 119:2
29:22 38:19,25	17:22 38:9	96:1,4,8,19,19	date 8:5 18:3
39:7,19 40:7	41:16,24 42:3	97:13,15,15,19	18:18 34:19
40:22 41:1	42:4,25 54:24	98:1,7,7,13,21	65:16 79:15,15
43:19,22 51:17	57:1,6,24 58:1	99:2,9,10	80:16 98:19,20
56:10,14 61:25	58:2 59:16,20	100:11,15	99:22 104:24
62:8 70:4,7,22	63:4,6,9,13,14	101:8 105:11	104:25 105:13
86:25 90:9,14	63:19,25,25	106:5 110:25	105:18 122:25
91:13 92:18	64:4,5,20,21	112:11,23	dated 57:21
96:9 97:11	64:23 65:14	113:7,9 114:12	dates 98:22
106:11	66:6,10,15,23	115:1,4,6	100:12,12
cryptocurrency	66:24,25 67:3	customers'	daunting 88:5
9:25 39:4,20	67:22,24 72:6	56:22,25	david 5:6
40:3,13,19	81:20 87:8	105:15	david 5.0

[day - delete] Page 13

100:5 108:1,13 3 108:17 110:9 3	23:22 28:5,15 30:22 33:22 34:24 35:7 36:13,21 38:14	115:17,19 118:21 120:2 <b>debtors'</b> 8:4	declare 26:10 declined 87:18
108:17 110:9	34:24 35:7		
		debtors' 8.4	
	36:13.21 38:14		92:15,17
Í	<i>'</i>	38:6 43:18,23	declines 18:9
118:18	38:24 39:4,6	45:6 46:12	deemed 61:5
days 95:16 3	39:11 43:15,17	52:22 54:19	83:3
108:20 117:21 4	14:3,8,19,20	76:13 77:17	deeming
118:1 4	14:24 45:2,4	<b>debtor's</b> 66:19	103:23
dc 4:12,19 4	16:14 49:8,12	70:12 74:16	<b>deep</b> 47:5
deadline 33:4 5	50:9,11,13	75:1 76:6 77:8	default 108:13
69:16 119:3	52:9,10,16	77:25 78:5	defaults 18:10
deadlines 5	53:2,3 54:16	80:12 82:2	41:9,10
36:16	54:17,19,22	87:15 117:5	defendants
deal 9:17 14:21   5	55:3,11,14,15	decide 14:7	77:10
38:12,14,17,25   5	55:17,19,24	27:8 39:22	defense 26:13
39:3 50:13	56:1,6,18	72:17 94:14	26:15,18,19,25
60:15 67:21	57:10,15,17,18	113:20,25	29:13,14,19
71:15 108:25	58:11 59:8,22	decided 16:3	77:22
114:10 117:3	60:4,10,24	41:2	defenses 76:24
dealer 48:23 7	70:18 71:4,11	decides 83:22	77:21,23
52:5	71:14,17 72:10	94:1	deferential
dealing 23:9 7	74:22,23 75:3	decision 2:1	106:8
dealings 39:14 7	76:9,12,14,24	19:24 24:2,12	deficient 49:5
deals 113:21 7	77:5,11 79:2,5	32:21 33:2,12	56:4,8
<b>debtor</b> 1:9 8:16 7	79:6,14,16,19	33:17 36:1,23	defined 40:5
19:16 31:19	80:3,6,8,15,19	37:5,6 40:11	79:12 81:9
49:19,19 61:14	31:7 82:1,3,7	68:11 69:17	defining 27:23
72:12 79:24	34:22 85:3,8	73:2 77:17	definitions
80:11,13,13	86:18,22 88:23	83:11 88:15,19	76:9
81:1 86:11,13	95:22 96:3	91:22 92:8	degree 42:12
89:20 99:20	7:24 98:2,6	94:20 108:6	<b>delay</b> 12:23
103:14,24	98:22 99:19	110:9 117:18	13:25 14:2
104:17 115:16	00:2 101:10	119:23	46:24 98:25
<b>debtor's</b> 49:4 1	02:6 103:11	decisions 51:24	<b>delays</b> 100:8,9
59:7	05:23,25	59:12 82:4	delete 10:23
<b>debtors</b> 3:18 1	06:2 107:20	92:8 100:23	67:4,11,17,25
7:23 8:4,6 12:2	09:6 110:17		104:16 119:22

deleted 103:22	detail 16:19	digital 1:7	disappointing
103:25	60:8 103:11,21	56:22,24 57:2	78:17
deleting 22:20	details 12:9	57:22,25	disarray
deletion 22:12	59:2 65:9	digits 15:25	110:21
deliberately	determination	diligence 55:16	disclose 54:18
81:2	30:15 31:21	56:2 57:16	70:19 71:10
deliver 44:18	59:6	diminish 50:18	73:8
demand 78:21	determine	direct 10:22	disclosed 7:6
denied 45:11	48:17 58:25	72:4 83:23	53:14,19 73:1
46:21	77:17	directed 72:7	103:12 116:5
deny 111:10	determined	82:19 84:18	disclosure 38:6
department	27:1 98:19	86:3 89:7	49:4 52:17,18
4:1 65:14	developments	directing 89:2	53:8,19,24
depend 53:9	42:7	94:16	54:5 55:7,10
106:4	dictate 33:3	direction 26:9	55:21 56:2,9,9
depends 9:20	36:16,23	69:3	56:17 70:2,3,5
116:17	dictation 37:5	directly 72:6	70:25 71:25
deposited	didn't 9:12	82:5,6	72:3,14,17,18
57:22	21:23,25 22:13	director 77:14	72:20 73:5,7
derivative 82:6	23:16 30:21	directors 7:6	73:12,16
describe 49:6	107:1 110:22	75:1 76:15,25	disclosures
55:22 74:4,4	112:5 119:15	79:13 85:23	52:19 54:25
96:21	differed 42:4	103:13,16	55:6,14 56:3
described 40:2	difference	diresta 6:4	70:14 72:2,8
51:22 54:4	15:23	109:24 110:2	72:23 73:22,24
57:10 70:15	different 28:21	111:14,17,17	discovered
78:24 103:8	40:18 48:7	111:19,23	56:7
107:13	54:22 98:3,4,4	112:4,7,18,20	discretion
deserve 46:22	98:13,13,15,15	113:4 114:13	91:24
desire 31:4	98:20,20,22,22	disable 11:17	discriminate
43:7 47:13	99:10 100:12	disadvantages	96:25
59:7 78:20	116:20 119:16	37:19	discriminated
102:12	119:17	disagree 25:21	105:6
desires 102:14	differently	46:12 52:25	discriminates
103:2	119:25	disallowed	96:19
despite 40:12	differing 40:17	104:2	discrimination
42:21			95:19 96:20

106:9	distribution	doesn't 10:13	driver's 8:9
discuss 69:25	50:7 60:19,22	15:10,17 17:3	dropped 104:4
76:2 118:3	61:4 62:16	27:14	due 55:15 56:2
discussed 50:1	71:6 83:5	<b>doing</b> 13:3	82:3 100:8,8
85:14 91:14	98:18 99:22	19:4 24:5	<b>dunks</b> 77:1
92:9 103:21	106:25	25:19 26:19,22	e
discussing	distributions	30:25 31:10	e 1:21,21,22
48:10	20:2,7 21:5	44:11,24,25	3:1,1 7:1,1
discussion	29:22 38:18	55:12 83:21	121:1 122:1
73:17 119:22	50:14 51:17	86:1,2 88:3	<b>e.g.</b> 83:24
discussions	56:13 62:3,4,7	92:4,5 93:1,17	84:13
12:8 17:16,19	62:11,19,23	94:2,8,22 98:2	earlier 66:22
55:2 84:23	70:9 83:6,9	104:12 111:4	earliest 34:19
dishonest	86:25 87:25	<b>dollars</b> 113:21	ease 15:1,19,22
58:22	90:9,14 91:12	116:12	15:23
disparity 41:22	92:17 96:2,8,9	don't 11:10,19	easier 69:6
42:9	97:12,25 98:6	14:19 16:4	easily 9:1
dispense 104:9	98:9,21,25	23:12 24:17,21	easy 104:9
dispersions	99:2,13 100:4	25:8 26:1 27:3	eat 46:25
58:16	100:7,11	30:5 32:12,13	ecf 73:13
dispose 68:23	105:16,17,18	32:18 33:23	economic
disposes 75:19	105:20 106:6,6	34:2,4,18	70:19
disputed 99:14	107:6 111:2,7	64:21 66:3	ecro 1:25
100:6	district 1:2	68:25 69:16	effect 27:9,10
disputes 17:17	108:9,18	74:2 91:17	27:17,19 30:17
100:7	ditech 84:19	94:15 103:4,21	52:16 56:1
disrespectful	docket 57:20	106:7 111:12	61:15 84:8
38:1	82:22	111:15,16	86:20 87:21
distributable	document	114:1,3,21	89:18 93:17
71:16	65:18 73:13	115:2 116:4,6	95:18 107:2
distribute	116:19	118:7	108:21 114:23
61:25	documentation	door 11:2 15:2	114:24
distributed	54:1	doubt 20:8	effective 34:19
39:1 52:19	documents	90:16	34:21 79:15
56:12 60:18	61:15 63:2	<b>draft</b> 107:23	80:16 98:19
70:8 99:21	65:18 77:25	drawing	102:20,21,23
100:1 106:1	103:19	119:10	102:25 103:4
	Varitant I ac		102.20 103.1

			1
104:24	emails 10:22	engaged 42:25	62:24 83:17
effectiveness	emanuel 3:10	43:5 46:17	92:22 93:24
119:13,16	35:6 76:18	52:4 82:17	94:7,22,23
effects 73:8	embodied	enhance 10:16	99:13 107:5
effectuate 35:4	101:12	16:11	112:12
effort 13:4	emergency	enjoin 25:13	<b>entity</b> 75:16
38:2 51:2	117:25	93:20,23	84:2 86:13
91:23	emery 5:8	enjoined 20:18	entity's 89:1
efforts 23:10	emphasis	91:1	entry 18:15,16
80:12	72:11 73:4	enjoining 19:4	110:10
ehrlich 76:13	emphasized	enormous	environment
76:21 78:15	45:25	41:22	40:1,14,16
79:4 101:10,12	employed	ensnare 26:8	<b>equal</b> 111:7
101:16	79:13	ensure 57:6	equates 113:18
either 19:15	employees	89:5 99:20	<b>equity</b> 5:16 7:9
20:21 31:6	57:25 79:12	<b>enter</b> 14:1 15:9	93:5 103:7
60:24 70:12	82:4 87:22	34:18 35:23	107:3,5
89:20 91:4	empower	36:25 64:23	equivalent
92:19	10:13 16:10	87:21 108:20	67:6
elect 8:23	enable 10:13	entered 25:21	errors 37:3
38:10 62:23	enables 10:20	37:6 41:19	especially
63:15 66:7,24	enabling 10:15	60:15 110:14	22:20 26:23
75:5 106:5	encompassing	entering 93:9	114:23
elected 89:10	81:2	entire 47:4	essence 98:6
97:15	endeavor	56:4 98:25	essentially
electing 59:23	36:25	entirely 50:11	19:22 21:8
60:5	<b>ended</b> 101:16	89:5	26:20 65:11
election 114:22	<b>energy</b> 37:15	entities 18:23	66:14 90:2
114:25	<b>enforce</b> 104:13	18:24 19:2,5	106:24 110:25
elections 63:10	enforcement	19:13 31:6	establishing
elects 12:18	20:19 27:1	85:7,16,24	8:22
13:14 64:5	48:12,14,16	86:18 87:3,23	estate 66:20
ellis 3:17 7:23	65:13 91:2	88:1 89:6	74:10,24 82:1
35:2 119:2	93:18	92:21	<b>estates</b> 103:14
eloquent 22:13	engage 20:10	entitled 21:18	103:15
<b>email</b> 33:22	90:18 92:22	21:19 26:21	estimates
	118:23	27:12,13,15	71:15

estoppel 93:5	74:21 97:21	90:10,11,18	expense 8:5,5
et 64:3	examination	exculpating	8:15 10:11
etcetera 16:17	58:9	24:6	13:24 14:23
17:3	examiner's	exculpation	15:13 18:2,11
eternal 17:20	42:1,8	17:17 18:2,22	expenses 15:19
<b>event</b> 38:12	example 48:3	19:6,7 28:16	46:25
80:15 95:23	48:19 66:7	28:19 31:18	expensive
96:16 107:21	75:1 99:12	36:8 76:2 82:9	46:24 47:5
113:25	exceeds 91:25	82:22 83:12,15	56:5
events 42:12	excellent 22:11	83:18 84:6,25	experience
eventually 47:1	26:14	85:15,18,19	13:1 78:8
66:6 69:5	except 14:15	86:9 89:13,14	102:5,21
everybody	19:16 21:12	91:20 95:11	expert 57:7
12:5 24:21	34:3 84:3	exculpatory	explain 9:6
29:20 32:19	89:21	77:24	30:7 36:24
111:6	exception	excuse 62:17	43:23 48:1,21
everybody's	119:14	76:25 98:19	54:10
24:25 32:17	excess 70:21	executing	explained 38:3
evidence 38:22	excessive 79:25	75:17	47:22 60:3
41:17 42:6,24	exchange 4:9	execution	71:4,18
43:8 44:9 46:7	4:10 43:14	19:20 20:5	explanation
46:19 51:25,25	45:21	89:25 90:12	45:5 46:8
52:10,12 57:16	exchanges 40:3	exercise 68:25	47:12 68:8,19
57:17,19 58:6	40:13	exercising	explanations
58:22 59:13,18	exclude 37:24	59:22 60:4	71:22 92:3
59:21 60:3	113:1,3	exhibit 73:12	explicitly 87:16
63:7 71:23	excluded 10:9	<b>exist</b> 44:2	express 13:1
76:15 78:23,24	106:24	107:1	expressed
78:25 80:18	exclusion	<b>exists</b> 103:17	78:18,20
81:5 87:18	14:11 80:16	<b>expect</b> 47:14	expressions
88:17,21	91:15,18	51:10 114:9	102:11
101:24	exculpated	116:21	expunged 69:6
evolving 52:23	19:6,17,18,19	expected 47:20	extend 33:19
<b>ex</b> 21:22 92:23	20:3,4,10 25:5	49:8 116:2	extension
exactly 24:11	29:1 31:20	expeditiously	109:20 119:3
24:13 28:3	82:24 84:1	35:4	extensive 52:23
41:20 73:19	89:22,23,23		102:5 120:3

extent 13:8	factual 28:22	figures 66:12	<b>fines</b> 20:5 25:6
19:14 26:18	<b>fail</b> 13:18	73:10	25:8 88:2
29:18 37:9	failed 54:18	<b>filed</b> 7:6 36:14	90:11
39:5 44:14	failure 53:11	40:20 43:12,14	<b>finish</b> 33:17
45:12 46:10	<b>fair</b> 16:19	51:5 57:20	110:1
50:14 54:12	51:15 93:5	72:21 75:20	finished 69:17
83:16 89:19	fairly 21:8	76:7 85:4	<b>firm</b> 42:3,10
105:15	82:23	93:13 96:11	59:16 76:18
extra 14:3	fairness 44:16	100:17 107:10	87:19 101:7
118:1	58:12 94:2	108:11	<b>firms</b> 40:3,21
extremely 9:25	faith 51:7	<b>filing</b> 77:13	41:3,8,14,17
54:10 79:17	<b>false</b> 58:12	filings 41:11	43:5 79:11
f	<b>far</b> 17:9 41:21	<b>final</b> 35:21	<b>first</b> 11:7 15:6
<b>f</b> 1:21,25 4:11	63:9 66:15	38:6 69:9	16:3 43:13,17
122:1	<b>fast</b> 8:8	81:12 108:2	45:17 46:12
<b>f.3d</b> 78:12	<b>favor</b> 75:12	119:23	56:9 58:24
83:25	fear 56:3	finalization	60:14 64:1
face 43:3 89:9	feasibility	18:15	65:15 69:1
100:8 112:8,9	43:16 49:13,13	finally 105:3	110:1 118:8
112:14	49:25 50:24	finance 7:20	<b>five</b> 71:7
faced 52:20	features 72:2	financial 41:7	108:20
facilitate 117:6	february 57:21	41:13 49:18	<b>flatly</b> 115:17
fact 20:9,11	federal 53:15	52:11 53:25	floating 32:3
28:1 30:15	54:3 75:20	56:20 65:12	32:11
38:4 40:12	85:6,10,21	76:14 81:20,24	<b>floor</b> 4:18 5:3
41:5 42:13	<b>fee</b> 116:1	<b>fincen</b> 65:12	fluctuate 100:3
59:17 62:6	fees 104:22,23	<b>find</b> 37:3 49:17	100:13
78:4,25 87:11	115:25 116:9	56:8 69:12	<b>focus</b> 118:18
90:17,19 93:9	<b>felt</b> 81:19	71:22 72:16	focused 39:9
95:13 98:10	ferguson 1:25	73:15 103:5	39:12
100:3 104:6	<b>ffdd</b> 83:24	109:19 115:4	<b>folks</b> 23:4
105:6 107:4	fiduciaries	finding 92:24	<b>follow</b> 38:3
facto 21:22	82:16 83:17	findings 36:17	53:25 55:22,23
92:23	figure 31:8	36:24 37:1	118:20,23
<b>factors</b> 77:18	46:14 47:6	<b>fine</b> 22:13	followed 49:17
78:14	115:10	23:15	following
			19:14 37:15

45:16 89:15,18	<b>four</b> 61:24 87:7	funded 84:2	gist 95:25
footnote 43:25	framed 55:5	<b>further</b> 7:13,15	106:10
footnotes 71:4	frankly 86:5	19:3,5 20:18	give 12:23
forbidden 51:7	109:15	35:15 39:2	32:19 37:20
<b>force</b> 98:24	<b>fraud</b> 31:22	41:5 42:7	59:25 69:4
108:18	80:17 91:16	44:11 45:12	79:2,17 86:11
<b>forced</b> 46:12	<b>free</b> 26:11	46:8 49:18	94:20 108:17
78:24	79:18 88:13	50:22 61:13	108:20 115:14
<b>forces</b> 106:4	98:10	63:18 70:16	117:7
<b>forego</b> 65:19	freedom 94:12	72:23 76:22	<b>given</b> 9:1 12:16
foregoing 20:9	freeze 47:5	77:8 78:6,6	14:6 24:20
90:16 122:3	friday 45:8	83:2 89:3,16	34:4 52:12
foreign 20:25	<b>friend</b> 101:9	91:1 93:23	59:14,18 62:4
91:8	friendly 101:16	101:17 118:7	68:18 73:3
forever 30:23	<b>front</b> 21:9	118:23	75:4 98:8
66:1	25:23 30:12	furthermore	111:2 114:20
<b>forget</b> 110:3	47:2,11	46:4 59:11	<b>gives</b> 12:16
<b>form</b> 38:19	frustrating	future 8:24	13:14 24:2
54:10 62:7,23	110:14	9:14 12:5	94:17
75:18 105:16	frustrations	20:20,22 24:1	<b>giving</b> 62:22
107:20	78:22	27:23,24 29:1	64:11 69:2
formal 46:1	ftx 41:12,18,21	29:15 40:15	80:9
formally 23:2	41:23 58:10,15	41:2 84:10	<b>go</b> 10:24 12:21
<b>format</b> 36:23	104:3	88:5 89:1 91:3	13:4,25 17:24
<b>former</b> 76:13	full 29:24	91:6 94:9,14	21:18 23:8,20
<b>forms</b> 8:10	51:15 81:6	106:3,17,19	26:2 28:9
75:7 98:22	107:7	futures 43:7	33:25 42:13
<b>forth</b> 19:7,8	fullest 19:14	g	50:24 65:3
23:13 32:6	89:19	<b>g</b> 7:1	67:13 69:1
75:13 91:22	<b>fully</b> 93:3	general 4:16	93:23 100:20
forthcoming	114:9	57:25	103:11 111:8
40:23	function 27:25	generally 38:8	119:13
<b>forum</b> 45:14	112:17	53:8	<b>goal</b> 105:19
forward 10:16	functioning	getting 15:1	109:4
27:20 56:6	11:12	32:5 118:20	goes 19:3 32:5
<b>found</b> 30:17	fundamentally	gina 6:4 111:17	65:20 80:5
48:22 72:15	9:20	gina 0.7 111.1/	
	<b>X</b> '4 4 <b>X</b>		

<b>going</b> 7:18	governing	greater 71:7	hang 88:5
10:16 12:4,23	77:25 83:8	72:11 73:3	114:18,18
15:8 16:2,22	government	greatly 38:4	happen 33:13
21:22 22:4	19:11 24:2	green 1:12	71:20 106:2
25:9,18 30:24	30:21 31:13	gross 31:22	107:8
31:9,10 32:17	51:14 85:25	80:17	happened
32:23 33:8,9	86:2,5 87:20	<b>ground</b> 93:21	41:18,20 42:6
33:13,16,17,18	88:1,4,7,11,14	96:13	58:15 59:15
34:9 35:3	88:22 89:10	grounds 51:20	happens 31:7
36:16 59:24,24	91:19 92:1,10	93:22	99:11
70:22 89:3	92:12,15,17	<b>group</b> 5:16	<b>happy</b> 18:1
94:21 107:25	93:12 94:5	42:17 59:9	100:22 113:23
108:17,18,23	95:3,8 117:20	84:14 103:7	hard 64:23
108:24 111:24	governmental	guarantee 53:6	73:15 115:4
115:4 116:24	17:16 18:23	105:7,21,24,25	haven't 19:24
118:6,11	19:2,4,13	guarantees	28:7 33:5 67:5
goldberg 3:8	20:15 21:12	71:21 106:2	67:15 104:25
34:20,20,24	22:8 29:22	guess 22:1	hawaii 95:23
64:25 65:4,6	31:5 52:25	47:24 48:8	95:24
67:1,9,19 68:6	53:10 85:7,16	94:10	heads 88:6
68:9 69:14,18	87:3 89:1	guidance 45:1	hear 34:1
109:2,3,3,9	90:23 95:12,15	47:21 94:20	45:14 47:12
111:25,25	government's	h	heard 33:3
112:6,10,22	26:20 34:18	hadn't 7:20	103:16
113:2 114:6,7	85:23 93:6	hage 100:19,24	hearing 2:1
114:7,20	95:2	101:9,14,17	3:10 7:4 20:12
115:13 116:4	granite 84:5	102:3,9 103:5	37:7,11,20,23
116:15,15	grant 75:5,12	hage's 101:25	38:5 44:14
120:7	79:5 94:12	hamilton 4:3	45:8 47:9
<b>good</b> 7:17 12:2	98:16	hand 42:14,14	48:20 51:9
17:4,15 28:11	granted 75:17	handle 54:24	55:8 57:10
35:5 39:22	79:3 85:20	59:16	60:9,14 61:3
43:9 51:7 65:5	gratitude	handled 28:9	66:22 69:24
119:5	120:7	37:17 42:11	71:13 81:17,18
gotten 12:1	great 12:23	handles 54:24	87:12 88:14
28:4	65:10	handling 41:21	90:20 93:8
		nanunng 41.21	95:25 118:24

hearsay 43:3	hire 12:21	35:10,24 36:2	94:16
<b>heart</b> 9:10,16	<b>hired</b> 76:17	36:3,4,10	ideas 39:22
<b>held</b> 26:21 57:2	history 11:1	64:25 65:4	identification
60:23 61:17	16:9,17	66:5,17 67:1	8:10 65:14,18
70:12 93:8	<b>hoc</b> 5:16 7:8	67:19 68:6	identifications
99:15	103:7	69:14,18 108:8	8:1
help 8:20 15:13	<b>hold</b> 56:14	108:22 109:3,9	identify 54:8
15:17 16:13	70:4 89:14	109:14,15,21	88:7
59:15 60:12	112:7	109:24 111:14	identifying
120:4	holder 79:20	111:17 112:1	8:22
helpful 23:14	holders 5:16	112:22 113:2	identity 100:18
38:2 66:21	70:13 107:3,5	114:7,14,16	ids 8:9 11:4
helping 13:12	holding 84:19	115:13,20,23	64:10 68:16
hendershott	107:4,6 114:2	116:4,15	<b>ignore</b> 98:10
5:22 75:23	holdings 1:7	117:10,13	illegal 25:17,25
118:12,14,14	84:16 105:12	118:9,12,14,21	29:23,25 30:14
118:17 119:6	<b>holds</b> 57:21	119:1,9,12,20	30:23 32:8,9
119:20,24	home 111:19	120:2,7	43:19,24 51:9
herrings 92:2	111:23 112:1	honor's 36:6,6	51:18 52:8
hey 21:23	<b>hon</b> 1:22	65:22	86:1 87:12,17
he's 26:6	honestly 18:23	<b>hope</b> 17:15,18	92:20
118:11	<b>honor</b> 7:7,10	17:20 28:16	illusory 106:13
hiding 26:3	7:15,22 8:18	33:7	imagine 8:25
54:17	9:5,10 10:21	hopefully 7:3	105:1
higher 65:21	11:7 12:7,25	28:13	immediate
78:21	16:7,19 17:11	hoping 26:4	61:8
highlighted	17:18,21 18:16	horrified 55:19	immediately
72:13 73:2	18:21 22:10,16	<b>hot</b> 13:2	56:4 61:1
highly 40:2	23:1,19 24:15	hours 33:13	68:22,23
51:4 52:23	24:16 25:11	hour's 37:9	immunity
hindsight	26:3 27:5	house 4:3	26:22 83:17
72:10	28:11,15,17,23	<b>hyde</b> 2:25	93:15 94:8,17
hint 21:12	29:4,11,13	122:3,8	94:18
<b>hinted</b> 51:21	31:15,16 32:22	i	<b>impact</b> 74:15
87:13	33:5,15,24	idea 30:10	impaired 97:1
<b>hints</b> 30:6	34:8,9,13,16	31:10 33:11	impede 50:8
	34:20 35:1,5,9	39:19 48:9	

_			
impermissible	included 52:19	34:24 75:23	65:20 66:3
91:23	55:6 57:12	108:14,15	67:7,17 68:5
implement	70:25 76:7	113:12,21	68:11,13,16,19
85:24	79:8 82:22	116:9 119:10	68:23 72:9
implementati	85:5 95:11	119:14,16	73:15,16,18
19:20 82:13	103:18	individual 9:14	111:12 112:20
89:25	includes 25:9	41:3 77:10	113:5,24 115:7
importance	38:11 50:18	100:21 101:3,9	116:21
24:20	63:3	individuals	infrastructure
important 8:22	including 18:8	92:21	57:3
64:19 72:12	37:11 41:9	industry 41:4,7	initial 98:18
115:9	43:23 56:19	41:13 43:4	initially 45:10
impose 24:8	66:4 75:22	57:8 59:15	injunctive
53:11 55:25	77:22 92:8	inevitable	22:21
imposed 24:1	incorporated	89:16 100:10	injured 82:3
89:11 94:4	63:1	inevitably	injuries 81:25
imposes 86:17	increase 71:9	100:3	82:5,6,6
impression	increased	inferior 66:15	inquiries 53:15
103:9	58:13	inflict 103:2	53:17 54:2,4
improper	incur 19:18	influenced	56:2 116:22
106:8 107:17	82:17 89:23	101:11	insiders 76:17
improperly	incurred 92:25	information	76:20
101:11	indefinitely	8:2,2,13 9:1,18	insight 115:14
improvement	66:1	9:22 10:5,9,9	insofar 85:20
22:19	independent	11:5,9,10,14	97:10
inability 93:7	7:5 58:4 76:15	11:16 12:1,12	instance 16:3
inadequate	103:13,15	12:15 13:6,13	58:25 64:1
55:1,21	indeterminate	13:17,19,21	118:8
inadvertent	47:5	14:6,11,11,13	instances 83:23
37:2	indicate 25:17	14:15,20,24	107:16
inadvertently	indicated	15:6,11,23	instant 12:24
38:15	41:22 104:14	16:4,6,16 17:2	69:10
include 31:18	indicates 31:23	17:3,5,8,23	instantaneous
55:2 61:14	indiscernible	54:1,16 57:11	13:7
76:9 79:10	8:19 22:10	58:14 63:19,21	instructions
96:9	23:10 24:22	64:1,3,10,12	37:25
	28:22 29:5,7	64:19,22 65:1	

: CC: -: 4	·	117.20 110.6	:9H 17.12 25.1
insufficient 72:1	investigation	117:20 118:6	i'll 17:12 25:1 119:21
	76:16,18 80:20	issued 20:23	i'm 9:3 13:11
insurance 77:9	investigations	83:11 91:6	
78:7	58:13	issues 7:4 9:7	15:4,10,10,13
<b>intend</b> 27:9	investment	17:12 23:3	16:21 17:24
46:7	20:25 39:20	24:20 30:10	18:1,23 21:9
intended 79:22	53:22 91:8	37:22 38:20,23	24:6 26:19
94:12	investments	39:10,13 45:3	27:5,10,18,22
intention 10:3	39:22	45:7 46:7,11	29:17,19 30:24
26:7 30:24	investors	46:18 47:14	31:10 32:1,19
51:8 85:11	102:12	48:8,9,15	35:8 36:3,16
intercompany	involuntarily	49:22,25 50:20	36:21 39:17
80:12 103:8	92:25 94:25	50:24 51:21	42:1 59:24
interest 5:16	involve 14:23	52:20 53:7,18	61:16 69:3
28:25 60:21	15:12 41:3	54:8 55:10,18	73:5 107:25
61:6,18 70:10	involves 52:24	62:5 68:11	108:17,18,23
80:9 82:21	involving	69:23,24 87:14	109:17 111:12
97:1 101:1	103:17	88:8 94:7	111:15,16
102:1 103:15	iridium 78:10	100:8 108:3	112:3 113:23
104:11	78:12	110:19 120:5	117:14 119:10
interested	irrelevant 92:6	item 35:15	119:10
35:11 45:14	isn't 67:14	106:16	i've 19:24 21:9
interfere 50:8	69:4 112:15	it's 13:21 14:2	21:19 31:12
91:24	issue 21:13	19:8 21:10	34:4 35:14
interim 27:17	29:4,15 32:23	22:19,20 25:4	50:1 59:11
internal 54:1	33:4 34:9 38:5	25:24,24 26:9	65:8 108:19
interpretation	44:2 47:10,12	26:9,18,19	114:20 115:12
119:9	47:15,16,16	29:10,15,20	i
interrupt 27:3	51:13 59:12	30:17 31:23	j 3:8
110:20	64:13 65:8	32:4 34:4,10	<b>j.d.</b> 22:16
interrupting	69:22 76:1	34:12 35:3	25:11
65:5	85:3,13,14	39:21 58:6	jail 25:9,19
introduced	95:22 96:14	95:6 114:3	january 53:20
23:6	103:17 109:7	115:9,11 117:1	54:6 55:20
investigated	109:12,14,16	117:13,25	60:14,16 72:21
77:1,2 81:10	109:20 110:12	i'd 16:19 17:11	73:17 82:22
	115:11,14,19	34:24	/3.1/ 02.22

jean 5:6	justice 4:1	12:9 13:7 14:9	landscape
<b>job</b> 26:7	justification	14:19,22 15:4	52:24
100:19 118:19	114:2	16:9 21:8,19	language 18:22
<b>john</b> 6:1	justifications	23:10 24:21	19:22,25 21:7
114:16	83:13 92:3,5,6	26:19 27:12,14	22:6,9,11,18
join 8:23 9:13	justified 114:3	27:15,24 28:4	22:21 23:4,14
10:3,14 66:7	justifies 81:6	30:20,22 32:12	24:18 28:13,16
67:10 68:3	k	32:24 33:23	31:19 32:18
joined 67:16	karen 4:21	35:3,8 42:14	33:11,21 34:2
67:18	23:1 31:16	47:19 48:3	36:8 61:14,19
joins 10:7	keep 14:18	49:8 63:3 72:6	70:16 77:24
11:21 16:8	25:1 33:14	92:22 94:22,23	80:22 81:9,11
<b>jones</b> 75:23	115:8	102:24 108:14	84:25 89:18
judge 1:23	<b>kelly</b> 5:20 7:10	110:14 111:22	90:2,7 91:14
58:24 69:11	kilpatrick 5:15	111:23 114:21	large 37:10,11
91:22 95:14	kind 11:18	115:3 116:3,4	74:9,13 101:15
108:18 118:10	16:15 23:13	116:7 117:17	<b>latam</b> 84:14
119:24	26:1 31:12	118:7	<b>late</b> 104:1
judgement	32:2,15 39:1	knowing 43:6	110:17
60:5 66:19	43:1 50:1,22	knowledge	latham 3:3
77:22 115:19	73:2 79:24	10:25 18:17	65:6 109:4
<b>judges</b> 102:24	80:3 85:8,9,20	50:8	111:25 114:8
judgment 59:9	89:4 91:20	known 9:15	116:16
59:22	94:8 95:15	32:6 79:19	law 19:15
judgments	97:25 98:6	knows 10:21	21:11 30:2,5
41:19	105:20 106:5	<b>kyc</b> 10:5,7 11:8	51:7 79:11
july 46:20 54:1	108:19 110:19	11:23 12:1,5	83:7 85:10,19
june 84:15	113:11,12	12:10,12 13:7	89:20 93:19
jurisdiction	kinds 42:12	13:23 14:12	101:7
91:25 95:5	kirkland 3:17	65:11,15,20,25	laws 20:13
jurisdictions	7:23 35:2	65:25 66:3,16	21:4 40:9
21:4,6 52:20	119:2	111:20 113:24	44:20 53:1
61:23 62:9,15	kirpalani 3:15	116:18,19	83:3 90:21
62:20 91:12,13	35:5,6,14,18	<u>l</u>	91:11
97:16 99:8	35:24 80:22	labored 37:18	lawsuit 73:9
100:16	know 9:6,12	lack 55:12	lawyers 102:22
	10:1 11:15,17		

[lead - made] Page 25

load 106,10	116.10 110.16	62.25 79.7	living 100.10
lead 106:19	116:19 119:16	63:25 78:7	living 108:19
leave 14:3,12	levels 65:11	79:3 81:9 84:7	llc 78:11,12
27:7 30:15	lexington 3:19	101:25	llp 3:17 5:15
69:8 115:4,15	lexis 84:14,20	<b>limiting</b> 19:15	loan 41:9
leaving 27:23	liabilities 88:2	89:20	loans 76:22
47:24	90:12 91:16	limits 23:25	77:7,9
led 41:10,13	93:1 94:4	116:20	locate 104:18
ledanski 2:25	liability 19:19	line 35:15	located 57:4
122:3,8	20:4 22:5 25:8	121:4	logic 67:20
ledger 57:25	31:12 77:14	lines 24:23	long 23:8 59:4
left 7:17 69:22	82:11,17,24	85:1 89:15	65:21 75:3
94:14	84:2 88:5 89:9	lingering 68:20	79:9 96:24
legal 38:22	89:24 90:10	links 72:4	look 22:25,25
45:7,9 46:19	liable 22:1 25:6	liquidation	23:15 24:22
47:10,13,15	30:19 83:7,21	49:18,20 50:22	81:11 114:1
77:21 83:13	88:2	52:10 70:24	118:6
86:8 88:8,16	license 48:25	71:3,9 74:2,14	looking 109:1
88:20 92:3,4,6	licenses 8:10	lisa 118:18	119:12,13
92:16 122:20	52:21 61:24	list 66:14 75:3	loren 6:1
legality 88:12	96:2 98:3,16	79:9	114:16,16,19
93:7	<b>lien</b> 104:8	<b>listen</b> 118:3	115:21,23
legally 52:13	<b>light</b> 58:15	listening 23:17	116:8,23 117:8
96:3	107:24	literally 28:2	lose 14:4,25
legitimate 17:1	liked 37:4	42:23 59:18	113:25
<b>lend</b> 56:24 58:2	<b>likely</b> 34:19	95:9	loss 15:12
length 78:2	48:14 49:17	litigate 88:12	lot 13:21
lengthy 33:2	50:18	litigation 84:11	103:20 107:22
37:7	<b>limit</b> 19:6	102:17,24	107:23 110:16
lessen 117:24	20:14,19,21,24	litigator	113:22 114:20
<b>letter</b> 42:17	39:3 90:22	102:21	<b>loud</b> 16:1
108:11	91:2,5,7	litigators	lying 58:20
letting 15:6	116:11,11,17	102:23 103:1	m
level 11:8	limitation 64:2	little 24:24	<b>m</b> 4:6,18
16:19 65:15,24	limitations	32:18 43:8	made 19:24
107:4 111:20	53:12	106:17 117:24	21:14 24:12
111:20 112:2,3	limited 47:20	live 61:22	
113:24 116:18	48:12 59:4,6	108:19	30:3 38:2,22 42:11 51:2,20
			42.11 31.2,20

53:25 54:2,19	117:18	marketing	79:22 97:5
55:14,15 57:11	makes 77:16	10:21,24 16:15	98:12,21 111:5
58:10,19 62:22	94:15 102:19	66:15 67:14	112:6,10 115:3
63:10 72:10	102:21 107:4	69:5	meaningful
75:7 76:10	110:16 115:6	markets 9:25	70:19 105:8
80:20 81:14	<b>making</b> 32:21	10:1,2 13:2	115:16
83:10 85:12,17	40:11 64:19	66:8	means 21:10
88:24 90:5	69:5 72:14	market's	30:2,10 46:24
92:2,11 95:4	85:8 94:19	106:14	51:7 71:21
95:21 97:3	107:19 114:10	masquerading	86:7 93:18
101:22 105:1,4	114:22	55:10	98:14 103:3
105:20 107:17	man 8:18,21	material 73:1	meant 23:12
110:22 114:25	9:5,9 10:20	<b>math</b> 113:8	24:1
madison 3:12	11:7,13,20	114:4	member 101:4
magazine	12:7,25 13:20	mathematica	101:15,18
42:16	13:23 14:10,22	114:2	102:1
mail 10:22	15:15,18 16:6	matter 1:5	members 79:9
mailing 66:14	16:18 17:11,14	28:22 59:17	97:7 100:21
<b>main</b> 9:18	29:5,7 33:5,14	80:8 85:19	101:5,21 110:6
maintains	33:20 34:6,8	86:4 93:9	mention 112:5
56:21 58:3	manner 20:7	99:24 111:9	mentioned
make 21:25	51:22 80:5	115:9	10:10,19 25:5
25:4 28:14	90:14	matters 46:17	111:21
30:14 32:18	march 1:15 8:6	81:10	merit 96:17
33:10 35:10	18:3 23:6,7	maximize	105:4 119:4
38:16,18 39:4	37:8,8 54:9	16:12 38:17	meritorious
43:2 47:3,17	122:25	maximizes	48:15,18
50:14 51:24	margin 56:25	11:1	message 44:17
59:12 61:3,8	marine 83:13	mcdermott 5:8	messengers
71:5 72:1	market 9:21	mcmahon's	44:16
86:25 87:24	10:2,4,16 39:6	91:22	met 96:24
88:15,16,19	63:23 71:20	mean 17:3	metallurgical
94:19,20 97:25	100:12 106:4	24:17 32:4	84:15
98:6 99:2,3	106:12,13,14	38:16 42:23	mew 1:3
104:2,22	106:20	48:23 50:20	michael 1:22
105:19 106:2	marketable	56:1 58:16	microphone
111:6 115:10	106:16	60:7 63:14	33:25

midday 108:11	misrepresent	<b>morning</b> 91:14	nastiest 102:23
middle 27:4	54:19	107:18	national 4:16
110:18	<b>missed</b> 35:18	morrissey 4:7	nature 77:20
might've 15:7	misspeak 37:3	28:10,11,12	navigate 120:4
mike 3:23	misundersta	29:6,11 31:15	ne 4:11
23:21	86:7	32:22,22 34:9	near 33:25
million 9:12	misuse 41:16	108:16 109:13	45:8
66:10 70:20	59:20	109:14	necessarily
71:6,16 74:9	misusing 42:25	mortgage	11:7 17:3 25:9
77:13,14 113:7	mitigates 10:5	104:8,13	40:10 44:17
113:8	modern 10:20	<b>motion</b> 109:23	46:3 103:3
mind 12:20	modification	110:4,15,15	107:24
40:17 47:22	89:12 115:16	<b>motions</b> 36:14	necessary 60:8
64:13 66:9	modifications	109:23 110:4	61:25 96:6
89:18 112:25	69:21	110:24	99:1 118:1
113:25 115:8	modified 20:21	<b>move</b> 58:1	need 9:3 11:5
mindful 15:5	63:17 89:14	117:17	13:18 15:12
<b>minds</b> 15:7	91:4 104:1,15	<b>moved</b> 18:3	16:22 22:23
16:5 21:25	104:22	<b>moving</b> 33:14	33:6 49:18
mineola 122:23	modify 29:18	117:22	50:21 96:15
minor 24:17	81:8 108:12	moynihan 5:20	103:21 108:5
minute 8:7	moment 36:3	7:10,10,15	109:18 117:24
minutes 33:13	59:24 76:3	murray 84:15	needed 53:22
109:6	monday 37:8	mute 29:9	54:6 62:10
misbehavior	108:21 109:16	mystery 34:10	100:10 104:15
41:16 43:1	109:20	n	needs 25:6,7
misconcepti	monetary 10:6	n 3:1 7:1 121:1	29:9 49:24
74:21	money 113:22	122:1	104:13 119:3
misconduct	116:10,14,25	name 13:13	negative 44:9
31:22 80:17	117:1	16:17 65:16	44:19
84:4 91:16	month 62:4,25	104:8	negligence
<b>misled</b> 81:19	69:7 116:14,25	named 7:14	31:22 80:17
81:21	<b>months</b> 46:22	names 7:5 8:21	negotiate
mismanage	62:9,19 67:16	103:12 111:16	115:15
82:3	96:7 97:14,17	narrow 21:8	negotiation
misrepresent	<b>moot</b> 76:11	narrower	19:20 89:24
81:23	110:13	19:12	
	77 '4 47		

neither 40:9	<b>note</b> 19:11 23:5	66:5,13,18	72:22,23 74:21
net 78:21	39:20 42:22	68:18	75:21 87:10
network 65:13	53:17 71:23	<b>nw</b> 4:18	92:9 95:14
83:14	72:3,19 73:15	<b>ny</b> 1:13 3:6,13	96:11 100:14
networks	93:12 95:3,8	3:20 4:4 5:4,11	100:17,19
65:23	105:10	5:18 122:23	102:3 103:20
never 58:18	noted 62:1	0	104:3,4 105:3
68:3 69:1	70:6 83:15,20	o 1:21 7:1	107:9,11
102:4	87:13 97:20	122:1	111:10
nevertheless	notice 8:4	oath 58:19	objectors 58:7
46:10 106:18	29:24 87:4	object 22:9	58:10
new 1:2,13 3:6	notices 32:5	28:6 51:15	objectors'
3:13,20 4:4 5:4	notify 64:8	103:25	106:22
5:11,18 8:23	noting 84:8	<b>objected</b> 19:13	objects 17:6
11:20 14:18,22	notwithstand	28:8 74:19	91:17
54:16 81:9	49:3	75:24 82:9	obligated
95:17,19,25	nullity 107:1	96:12 103:7,23	21:16 75:8
96:4,4,6,8,10	number 7:5	objecting	obligates 88:4
96:12,14,18,19	9:2 10:8,19	54:21 55:3	obligation 47:3
98:24 99:2,4	11:17,22 12:3	<b>objection</b> 7:13	86:18
104:5,8,12	12:8,17,19,24	7:16 28:3 31:9	obligations
108:10	13:16 14:1,7	43:13,15,21,25	52:12,14
news 58:8	14:16,18,21	45:13 47:15	observations
112:19	15:3,9,24 16:9	51:4,20 70:3	43:11
<b>newsom</b> 75:22	16:14,16 23:2	70:23 73:10,24	obtain 53:11
newspapers	37:10,11 40:14	74:3,6 75:19	54:22 55:4
42:16	54:11 64:24	76:8,11 85:17	62:10 96:6
nick 24:18	65:16 74:19	95:17,21,24,25	obtained 46:5
nine 15:25	77:18 78:18	96:16,21 97:10	54:22 56:18
nits 35:15	79:6 81:17	97:23 103:19	57:15 68:24
nominal 60:20	82:22 85:5	104:6 107:2	96:7
70:10	100:22 101:8	119:4	obtaining
non 48:22	107:14 114:3	objections 30:4	53:10
75:24,25 76:3	numbers 8:17	39:9,10,11,12	obviously 12:8
normal 39:7	12:4 16:22	43:12 44:13	33:8 51:8
northern 57:4	17:9 64:3,14	54:14 55:5,13	109:16 117:17
	64:17 65:10	69:23 70:2	
		19.23 70.2	

[occur - orders] Page 29

	I	I		
occur 21:5	<b>ohio</b> 84:16	ongoing 55:17	112:12,24	
34:19 82:13	okay 8:11,14	open 7:4,17	113:17,18	
91:13 98:5	11:25 12:15	11:5 13:3	<b>opted</b> 8:2 11:3	
106:19	16:21 17:10,11	56:16 64:13,20	15:6 115:17	
occurred 82:12	17:13 18:5,12	68:21,25 69:8	<b>option</b> 38:11	
occurrence	18:20,24 22:15	87:8 100:10	50:12,19 67:16	
80:15	24:14 25:3,10	113:20,25	71:8 86:11	
occurring	27:3,12,19,20	<b>opened</b> 113:15	106:18,20	
92:13	29:10 30:17	opening 69:1	oral 80:23	
<b>odd</b> 67:12	31:14 32:14,17	operate 40:3	oranges 74:7	
104:6	33:19 34:7,23	41:6	<b>order</b> 11:23	
odds 40:24	35:17,24,25	operated 39:25	18:15,15,19	
offends 25:22	69:13 106:11	41:6,23 42:10	19:1,4,8,9	
91:21	109:8,10,11,16	operates 40:1	20:20,23 22:2	
<b>offer</b> 45:1	109:22 110:1,2	operating 44:4	22:21 24:5,6,9	
46:19 52:17	112:4 113:3,4	44:7 45:21	25:20 26:14,16	
56:25 57:16	114:15 115:12	48:2 78:11,12	26:23 27:8,9	
87:18	116:8 117:7,8	operation 11:2	27:11,18 33:11	
offered 42:23	118:8,9 120:6	operational	33:12,18 34:12	
45:24 52:10	okike 3:22 7:7	52:11	34:14 35:23	
63:7 76:15	7:22,22 8:9,12	operations	36:5,25 49:16	
88:18,21	8:15 10:10	10:13,16 16:11	60:15 61:10	
offering 44:9	17:18,21,25	30:9 45:7	69:9 81:12	
<b>office</b> 5:1 22:17	18:6,13,21	opportunity	84:25 85:4	
54:14 70:1	35:1,2 119:1,1	22:25 29:24	86:20,20 87:21	
82:8 108:9	120:2	36:5 51:15	88:3 89:7,17	
117:14	<b>old</b> 122:21	62:21 69:5	91:3,6 93:2,9	
officer 3:10	omission 80:14	75:4 87:5 88:7	94:19 104:2,10	
76:14 77:6,14	omitted 78:13	<b>oppose</b> 34:13	107:14,18,20	
officers 75:1	onboards 9:23	opposed 41:24	107:23 108:3	
79:13 82:4	once 17:5	95:20	108:13,21	
85:23 87:23	32:22 33:17	opposition	110:10,11,13	
<b>officers'</b> 77:2,4	37:1 42:5 44:5	21:14 31:7	ordered 26:23	
official 37:6	44:23 45:22	<b>opt</b> 7:25 16:24	31:13 85:2	
46:4 78:10,11	56:2 87:1	62:22 64:7,9	93:1 94:8	
79:8 100:20	97:14 107:7	64:15 68:15	orders 86:15	
	118:21	75:6,8,17		
TT ': .T 10.1.'				

ordinarily	<b>owned</b> 75:16	90:1 111:20	78:17,19 79:7
106:13	106:7	112:2,10	79:7,18 80:3,4
ordinary 28:6	owner 60:20	119:22	82:11,16,21,24
93:3	105:4	partial 111:2	83:20 85:7,15
organize 101:6	owners 105:5	participants	88:6 90:18
organized	ownership	37:11 38:1	108:14 118:4,4
86:13,14	104:11	93:14	parties' 62:1
original 19:12	p	participated	63:3,8 78:4
62:18 85:18	<b>p</b> 3:1,1 7:1	113:13	<b>party</b> 11:23
89:12	<b>p.m.</b> 69:19	participation	13:9 18:18
ought 27:22	pace 69:16	37:14	19:16,18 37:25
45:13	page 24:14	particular	39:20 47:19
<b>outset</b> 39:15	73:12 121:4	33:11 37:23	52:1 57:7 63:7
44:14 47:9	pages 56:17	39:22 40:21,21	73:3,20 75:24
48:20 101:5	paid 77:12	42:10,15 43:22	75:25 76:3,8,9
outside 29:1	pain 103:2	46:16 53:1	80:11 89:21,22
76:17	pan 103.2 paper 26:20	59:7 64:4	89:23 90:10
overall 32:7,10	113:8	72:11 76:11	91:21 93:22
overreached	papers 93:13	103:4	119:10
28:5	94:6	particularly	party's 79:23
overrule 52:6	paperwork	7:19 17:5 39:6	<b>pass</b> 73:6
70:22 100:14	100:9	54:7 58:22	passed 81:1
overruled	paragraph	parties 18:14	97:14
107:11	19:6 20:9	19:7,17 20:3	passports 8:10
overstep 30:25	34:12 90:17	20:10 25:5	past 10:15,25
overwhelming	paragraphs	28:25 29:1	16:17 41:8
66:20	19:8 22:12	33:22 34:11	95:10,16
overwhelmin	85:5,5	35:11 37:12,13	patrick 7:11
97:4	paris 3:10	37:21 42:16	<b>paul</b> 100:18
own 16:11,12	parlance 49:14	45:14 47:17	<b>pause</b> 37:13
19:11 22:3	part 8:22 10:9	50:12 51:23	81:16
35:8 43:18	10:20 12:11,13	54:21 55:3,20	<b>pay</b> 9:11 10:6
50:3 54:19	13:5 14:25	57:20 58:4	11:23 70:21,21
75:2 76:6	16:7 29:16	61:13,21,23	113:19,23
79:20,23 92:8	34:14 36:19	62:13 64:6,9	115:1 116:2,9
93:6 100:9	78:21 79:3	68:2 70:15	116:25
107:7	80:6 82:23	74:19,25 75:3	
	Varitant Lac		

maximonta 77.2	novoontogo	notition 70.15	52.12 59.25
<b>payments</b> 77:3 78:3	percentage 78:21	petition 79:15	53:13 58:25
		petroleum	59:5,17 61:14
pays 107:7	perfectly 22:6	83:14	61:20 63:2
penalties 20:5	88:20	pharma 91:22	71:17 74:1,8
20:22 22:1	perform 52:12	<b>phone</b> 7:9 22:8	74:14,17,20
23:25 24:9	52:13 102:9	29:9 111:12	75:12,13,13,14
25:6,8 90:11	period 7:25	112:7,14,15	76:2,7 80:2,10
91:5 94:4	13:15 60:22	phrase 79:22	82:10,14,20
pending 28:24	61:4,5 62:5,25	80:4	83:2,5,9,10
36:19 41:1	64:8,15 67:14	phrased 49:12	84:1,2,3,18,19
46:20 67:3	68:14 69:7,7	piece 8:25	84:25 85:24
109:18	113:17	<b>pit</b> 102:13	86:4,8,10,11
people 7:13	permissible	119:17	86:14,15,19,21
10:2 13:21	19:14 89:19	<b>place</b> 12:13	86:22,24,25
15:1,5,5 16:3	permit 38:25	13:6 14:13,14	87:1,6,9,13,24
21:11,15 23:10	51:22 63:6	15:7 46:13	87:25 89:8,22
25:18 26:8,21	98:9	55:23 57:5	90:8,15,18,25
27:10,11,15,22	permitted	66:1 73:19	91:10 92:16,18
30:14,16,18	66:18	80:16 99:1	92:20 95:18
31:12 33:9,16	persisted 40:12	110:12	96:6,18,22,25
33:18 34:1	person 11:24	placed 73:21	97:2,4,6,12
39:18 43:6	25:13 75:16,16	places 37:3	98:1,5,12,14
58:20 67:5,13	personal 13:1	72:15	100:14,18
67:15 88:1	101:3 102:20	<b>plan</b> 19:12,17	101:2,13 102:4
89:6 94:2,3,13	personally	20:1,8,10,17	102:7,13,20
94:13,20 99:15	30:19	21:3,9,15,16	103:8,19,22
102:15,15,21	personnel	22:2 23:11	104:15,16
102:23,24,25	86:19,23 88:6	27:19 28:20	105:10 107:2,4
103:12 104:18	persons 41:21	29:21 30:1,13	107:12,22,25
109:17 110:14	79:13,17	30:15 34:21	110:8,10 111:2
113:13,14,15	perspective	35:4 36:13,15	113:16 121:5
113:16,18,20	67:22 105:22	38:7,8,11	plans 28:3
114:22,25	117:20	43:16 46:12	75:10 82:15
117:15	pestering	47:2 49:13,16	95:9 99:11
percent 56:21	69:11	49:20,21 50:11	plan's 100:15
58:18 69:3	peter 4:6 108:8	50:18,21,23,25	platform 8:24
71:7,8 114:11	117:13	51:6,6,11 52:7	9:13,15,23

	T	I	
10:3,14 12:12	34:18 39:21	practical 50:16	prevent 31:10
16:8 56:16	43:2,21 44:6	99:19,24 115:9	53:11 64:11,16
57:1 66:7	45:9,10,15,19	117:4	98:2 101:1
67:25 68:3	45:23 46:1	practice 93:4	prevented
101:17	49:4 53:4	practices 57:14	20:16,18 89:3
please 15:13	64:20 85:17,19	<b>pre</b> 13:8 27:1	90:24 91:1
27:3 60:2	85:23 86:5	66:16	preventing
pleased 7:12	87:8,19 88:11	precise 117:7	93:18
<b>plug</b> 12:20	90:20 105:23	predict 49:6	previously
13:16 14:17	positions 40:24	53:3	22:22 60:25
<b>plus</b> 79:11	position's 28:9	predictions	83:11 85:16
<b>pm</b> 1:16	possibility 69:8	107:8	104:14 106:7
120:13	106:18	prefer 58:8	price 9:12
<b>point</b> 7:21	possible 31:23	62:3,16	99:17,19
10:19 18:13	32:8,9 34:22	preference	106:14 115:16
25:1 29:2	36:22 37:20	73:9	prices 39:6
31:17 47:18	52:25 71:9	preliminary	99:8 100:3
48:19 59:14	81:2 105:19	72:20	106:12,13
65:1 67:6,13	109:5 117:18	prepared	primarily
67:15 70:6	117:25	36:22 65:21	105:6
73:17 81:16	possibly 45:4	88:9 89:13	primary 38:5
99:7 104:3	47:19 81:12	preposterous	60:12
109:12 111:6	95:23 105:20	16:5 25:24,25	principles
pointed 58:10	post 21:22	28:9 30:17	91:21 93:5
<b>points</b> 28:15	92:23	present 66:9	<b>prior</b> 18:15
31:7 48:10	postulated	presented	54:25 56:3
49:11 78:23	101:8	38:22 71:24	<b>pro</b> 5:23 6:2,5
87:19	potential 39:14	101:19	37:11,13,20,24
<b>policy</b> 66:18	43:4 48:12	preserve 78:5	38:1 78:17
<b>poor</b> 108:18	52:17 73:8	<b>press</b> 74:3	102:12 114:16
portion 77:4	102:16 106:15	pressed 95:24	118:15,17
portions 75:21	115:4	presume 58:20	problem 31:2
<b>pose</b> 92:3	<b>power</b> 98:14	58:21	32:13,13 47:7
<b>posed</b> 54:14	98:16	pretend 113:19	74:6 98:24
75:21 88:8	powers 20:15	pretty 13:2	problems
position 20:12	90:23	17:10	28:24 31:25
25:23 32:19			41:13 50:6
		1014	

	•		
55:12	projections	63:1 69:21	protocols 57:5
procedures	70:25	72:19 74:20,22	57:7 58:3
58:4	prominently	76:12 77:3	<b>prove</b> 43:16,18
proceed 17:12	72:13	78:1 79:2,5,17	44:4,9,19 45:3
50:21 59:23	promise 110:3	79:18 80:2	45:4,5 49:13
60:5 69:25	promptly	81:7,8,8 82:2,9	provide 39:2
86:11	36:22	82:22 84:24	45:9 46:7
proceeding	<b>proof</b> 106:21	85:4,15 87:4	57:13 61:10
20:18 27:1	106:23	88:12 89:17	63:18 64:25
29:15 91:1	proper 47:18	90:7 97:13	65:9 70:16
proceedings	55:13 83:12,18	100:14,18	71:17 75:10
93:14 120:12	84:17 93:6	101:19 104:21	77:3 97:6
122:4	property 99:25	107:18 114:11	104:10 107:3
proceeds 77:9	104:7,9,11	proposing	110:20 119:2
78:7	proportionate	18:25 50:9	provided 8:4
process 10:21	74:15	proposition	18:22 19:3,5
14:25 32:10	proposal 16:24	75:11	20:8 47:21
56:5 69:1	19:11 62:18	prosecute	57:13 90:15
101:6 106:25	71:2,2,5,12	26:15,17	provider 11:23
108:4 110:18	103:24	prosecuted	provides 38:9
110:20 115:25	proposals	26:12	39:23 50:11
processing	40:18 88:24	prosecution	75:14 86:12
100:9	propose 19:13	25:13 26:11	95:18 96:22
produce 71:15	20:1	prosecutor	98:5 110:7
products 56:25	proposed 7:24	26:6,17	providing
professional	19:12 21:10	prospect 42:9	11:21 98:12
104:22	22:21 24:23	88:5 106:17	provision 8:15
professionals	30:1 34:12	118:5	20:14,19 21:2
79:10 87:23	36:6,12,19	protect 84:17	28:20,21 31:18
profitability	38:7,12,14,17	protected	69:8 82:9,10
16:12	38:24 39:12	54:12 93:15	82:23 83:12,18
program 53:21	43:3,16 47:2,8	protecting 23:9	84:1,7,8 85:19
65:14	47:11 49:13,21	protection	89:13,14 90:22
programs	51:6,11,16	18:11 21:18	91:2,10,20
16:11	52:9 56:20	83:19	97:20 99:3
project 55:17	58:25 59:3	protections	108:12 109:10
	60:8,11 61:22	61:9 63:18	
	1	1	1

	22.21	110.1=	60 11 1 = 60 10
provisions 18:1	purpose 32:21	118:17	68:11,17 69:10
19:1 28:6	86:14	questioned	70:1 84:10
49:15 59:1,5	pursuant 57:2	44:13	95:16 98:24
61:10 63:4	65:12 83:5,10	questions	103:10 108:14
72:5,11 76:2	pursue 74:24	37:21 42:18,21	110:15,19
82:16 83:15	74:25 78:5,20	43:6,10 53:21	raises 31:4
84:17 85:15,18	118:6	54:11 55:9,18	47:13 96:14
95:11,13	pursued 48:25	60:13 71:13	raising 42:18
103:18,23,25	90:2 92:20	100:25 103:10	43:6
104:16,19,21	pursuing 76:20	107:22 114:17	ramped 58:13
104:23 107:15	pursuit 102:16	115:24 117:7	ran 102:16
107:24	purview 29:2	quickly 9:1	ranged 95:4
proviso 18:25	<b>push</b> 17:8	14:2 31:17	rather 38:19
19:2 23:6	<b>put</b> 12:23 19:7	34:22 96:3	55:13
psaropoulos	23:11 25:19	109:5 117:17	reach 9:21
76:14,21 78:15	37:15 43:7,11	117:22	reached 7:21
79:4	47:4 72:11	<b>quinn</b> 3:10	50:3 57:18
<b>public</b> 41:20	85:22 98:5	35:6 76:18	68:2
42:4 45:13	109:20 118:19	quite 29:20	<b>read</b> 7:23
<b>pull</b> 119:12	putting 64:19	30:7 39:17	17:21 19:10
punish 86:2	69:2 117:6	97:24	21:7 22:9
purchase 9:12	q	<b>quote</b> 75:20	26:20 28:17
80:7,7	qualifications	quoted 73:10	34:3 35:19
purchaser 8:3	100:24 102:9	r	85:6
18:6,10 21:3	qualified 26:21	r 1:21 3:1 7:1	readily 64:20
36:19 59:4	27:9 83:17	122:1	98:11
91:11	93:15 94:17	raise 29:4 30:9	reading 2:1
purchases	102:7 103:5	32:23,25 34:10	61:16
43:18,20	<b>question</b> 7:18	45:7 48:16	ready 18:6
purchasing	16:18 39:18	94:9	30:4
52:2	49:2,9,10	raised 23:4	real 43:5 102:2
purdue 91:22	62:13,20 68:17	29:2 39:10	102:19 104:7
purported 92:6	69:10,11 96:15	42:9,21 43:10	106:20 114:21
104:7	109:24 111:11	46:18 49:22	really 9:6,10
purporting	115:22 116:7	50:20,24 54:11	50:24 64:21
29:17	116:10 117:3,4	55:18 60:13	67:21 72:25
	117:16 118:15	62:6,13,19	79:21 88:11
		102.0,13,19	

	. <del>-</del>		_
96:21 97:5	rebuked 44:14	recoveries	regards 115:24
110:16,23	<b>rebut</b> 46:19	46:25 50:17	116:10
115:5,9 120:4	92:5	71:1,7 73:10	regimes 40:19
120:5	recall 66:10	73:11,23,25,25	42:13 98:20
reason 17:4	95:14	74:8,11,15,17	register 49:24
25:14 26:15	receive 37:1	74:18 77:8	52:5 53:22
30:13 31:5	47:1 50:17	78:6	registered
49:25 50:7,19	56:13 62:7	recovery 107:3	48:22
50:23 72:16	63:14 96:2,8	red 92:2	registering
reasonable	97:11,13 98:21	reduce 39:5	44:5 45:22
28:6 30:25	99:10,10,13	reducing	registration
59:8,22 60:4	100:6,11 106:5	105:21	44:21
71:22 77:18	106:6	reemphasize	registrations
78:16 79:1	received 10:22	81:16	44:12
83:22 103:6	53:15,20 55:24	reference	regulation 40:8
reasonableness	99:15,22	49:14	51:12,19 83:8
90:5	receiving 45:5	referred 42:16	85:10,21 87:7
reasonably	recent 41:11	61:4	93:19
36:25	42:17	referring 72:15	regulations
reasoning	recently 56:6	reflect 89:17	20:13 53:1
84:12	104:7	91:16	66:2 90:22
reasons 9:5	recess 60:1	reflects 20:9	98:8,15
17:1 21:17	recognize	90:17	regulator
30:6 43:17	63:22 111:16	refused 37:25	47:10,14 51:10
44:10 46:17	recognizes	regard 13:22	51:12
52:8,15 62:3	112:14	40:21 42:22	regulators 31:2
71:3 74:4 86:8	recognizing	54:8 61:11	40:6 47:6 53:3
89:4 92:3 95:7	24:23 89:15	63:18 70:17	87:11 97:5,18
107:10 110:22	recollection	83:12 92:2	regulatory
rebalancing	73:20	113:4	20:11,20,22
20:1,6,16	record 2:1 7:24	regarded 47:22	28:23 30:9
25:19 29:21	17:25 30:12	regarding 21:3	31:4,8 39:13
32:6,7 43:24	33:3 35:19	62:6 76:1 83:4	40:1,5,14,16
51:16 86:24	36:17 45:17	91:10 104:1,21	40:18,23 41:2
87:23 90:8,13	48:13 65:6	108:13 109:16	42:13 49:6
90:24 92:15	74:4 118:19	114:17	52:8,18,19,21
	122:4		52:23 53:4,6

	-		_
53:14 89:4	80:2,24 81:1,4	renewed 80:25	requesting
90:19 91:3,6	82:2 89:21,21	reorganization	87:20 99:5
91:24 92:14	91:21	36:13 38:8	108:12
93:1,19,21	released 75:15	47:2 49:19,20	requests 57:11
94:10 98:3,20	76:8 79:10,12	50:22 86:8,10	require 11:8
100:8	79:18,23 80:3	repeatedly	11:10 14:22
rehypothecate	80:4,11	87:18	66:6 67:12
58:2	releases 19:16	repeating	84:9 86:22
reimbursement	35:12 39:11	51:10	99:25 107:21
8:5,15 18:2,11	74:20,22 75:5	repetitive	115:16 117:19
reinstate	75:6,12,25	107:16	required 8:18
113:24	76:1,4,6 79:2,3	replace 110:6	11:14 44:4,11
reject 46:13	79:8,16,18	report 42:1,8	52:5 53:4
52:6,15 72:16	81:7,8 82:2	reports 58:8	59:12 89:7,10
rejected	releasing 76:8	represent 23:2	92:22 94:21
115:18	relevant 15:18	77:4	96:1 97:7 99:3
rejections 83:9	15:21 16:10	representation	99:24 102:8
relate 85:20	48:6 75:20	58:18	requirement
related 19:1	78:14,23 82:23	representations	13:25 89:11
53:17 80:15	87:3 97:2	42:10 58:10	requirements
97:10	101:15,18	representative	40:5 44:21
relating 18:14	reliance 24:9	7:8 79:25	51:5 59:6 67:2
41:1 53:20	26:14 29:18	representatives	98:3 106:9
76:21 77:7	relied 13:8	45:16 85:9	requires 20:10
80:5	92:7	86:23	20:20 59:21
relation 78:4	remain 66:1	represented	60:3 65:15,17
relationship	remainder	41:24 101:9	87:25 90:18
101:16	50:9	102:6	91:3 93:10
relative 66:15	remaining	represents	requiring
relatively 14:2	13:17 56:23	91:23 106:14	14:23 63:4
37:16 39:10	63:13 107:11	request 33:20	rescission 80:7
96:2 104:9	108:3	36:4 38:6	resentment
<b>relay</b> 119:6	remedy 48:6	45:11 53:25	78:19
release 19:16	remind 15:4	57:15 69:19	reserve 25:18
29:3 74:23	<b>remove</b> 110:5	109:18 119:9	26:1 57:23
75:2,17,18	rendered 56:4	requested 66:5	77:11
77:5,6 79:5		103:22 118:21	

[reserved - saw] Page 37

reserved 99:21	result 37:19	31:14	107:19
reserves 56:21	50:17 56:7	<b>right</b> 7:2 10:21	ruled 45:11
resolution 7:24	78:2 81:23	10:22 11:6	rules 24:2,4
46:23	99:6	12:11 16:1	38:3 98:8
resolutions	resulting 71:6	19:11 23:18	<b>ruling</b> 29:16
7:21	results 49:6	24:8 25:18,24	43:2 47:3,18
resolved 17:17	55:2	26:2 29:17	rulings 36:22
51:13 95:22	resumption 7:3	32:17,21 34:8	36:24 37:1
100:7 103:9,19	retail 11:2	34:17 35:25	39:16 81:14
103:20 108:3	67:21	36:11 48:10	121:3
resonance	retained 78:8	60:2 63:23	run 11:24 14:1
67:20	returned	64:16 66:25	66:8 117:14
resources	104:19	67:1 68:6,7,10	S
56:20 77:2	returning	68:25 69:20	s 3:1 7:1
78:4	117:16	79:20 96:21	<b>s.a.</b> 84:14
respect 17:22	returns 110:24	103:16 109:11	<b>s.d.</b> 84:16
18:21,25 28:16	reveal 46:5	109:22 110:18	s.d.n.y 84:6,20
36:1 45:3	revealed 53:24	115:7,21 117:9	s.d.n.y. 59:10
47:10 95:1	56:10,18	117:12 118:10	83:14 84:15
96:25 119:3	revelations	119:19	sacrificing
respectfully	41:15	<b>rights</b> 36:18	61:9
66:16	reverberated	77:11 78:5	sad 117:1
respective	41:12	98:18	safe 57:6
86:23	review 28:13	rise 80:9 94:17	sale 30:8 38:9
respectively	36:5 81:3	102:1	50:7 80:7,8
60:25	101:20	risk 94:14,24	sales 39:4,5
response 64:6	reviewed 58:4	106:15	43:19,20 87:15
responsibility	72:19	risks 52:18	sanctions 88:2
104:17	revisions 33:10	<b>road</b> 9:24 94:1	94:4,25
rest 17:22	85:4 107:17	122:21	sat 25:16
59:25	rewards 53:21	robust 39:8	satisfied 18:7
restrict 88:25	106:15	role 58:24 59:4	18:17 104:20
restrictions	richard 4:7	77:16	satisfy 58:6
53:12	28:12 32:22	routine 82:15	102:14 103:1
restructuring	<b>rid</b> 68:4	rule 34:11,15	saved 84:10
80:12	ridiculous	51:19 65:12	saw 35:13,21
	15:10 27:11	83:8 87:7	30.13,21

saying 12:3	46:6,9,10,15	57:7 58:3 64:3	selected 7:14
16:2 19:23	47:21,21 48:1	64:14,17,24	101:7
24:5 25:15	48:5,7,11 49:1	65:9,16,23	selection 7:12
27:19 29:20	49:3,9,22 50:2	66:5,13,17	59:3
90:4 92:14	50:20,24 51:2	68:18 80:8	<b>selfies</b> 8:1,7,9
93:25 113:6	51:5,14,25	113:5 114:3	11:4 64:9
says 19:2,5,22	52:16 53:18,20	115:7	65:17 68:15
21:8,16 30:1	53:24 54:8,9	securityhold	112:11,23
60:16 90:2	54:14 70:18	103:7	sell 9:16 68:3
94:18	87:13,16 88:25	sec's 40:25	seller 18:3
scale 35:15	93:21 94:1	45:9,15 47:20	selling 52:2
scaled 35:11	second 9:21	48:20 49:11	115:20
85:1	15:19 45:20	see 7:5 22:23	senators 42:18
scared 15:8	56:17 61:21	32:18 33:9,18	send 22:24
scenario	65:17 77:16	42:7 57:20	sending 33:21
109:19	114:18 116:10	59:9 62:9	sense 14:4 32:2
schedule	section 49:15	67:24 73:5	61:4 94:15,19
108:19	50:1,25 61:19	78:10 83:13,24	99:3 110:22
scheuer 4:14	86:12,17 87:22	84:13,19 94:15	sensitive 13:22
36:2,3,8,10	96:21 97:8	109:6 110:19	17:4 63:18
scope 59:8	securities 4:9	113:12 116:23	64:2
79:16 81:6	4:10 40:8,9	117:5	sent 11:16
82:9 83:12	43:14,20,22	seek 55:18 86:2	42:17 44:18
94:18	44:5,7,20	117:18	54:2 75:7
se 5:23 6:2,5	45:21 46:18	seeking 28:15	112:18,19,21
37:12,13,20,24	48:2 49:24	seem 11:25	sentence 22:2
38:1 78:17	security 8:17	40:6 107:15	23:24 27:4
102:12 114:16	9:2 10:8,18	seemed 23:3	sentenced
118:15,18	11:17,22 12:3	seems 12:17	94:25
seated 60:2	12:4,17,19,24	15:9 16:5 23:5	sentencing
sec 23:7 36:4,4	13:16 14:1,7	23:14 31:14	92:23
40:20 43:14,17	14:16,18,20	40:23 67:12	separate 32:24
44:3,6,11,13	15:3,9,24 16:9	seen 22:20	76:1 103:13
44:14,18,23	16:14,22 17:9	105:1 119:13	september
45:1,4,5,8,12	45:18 47:23,23	segregates	54:3
45:16,17,20,24	48:5 49:23	57:24	serious 86:6
45:25 46:2,4,4	50:4 52:3 57:5		

[serve - spaces] Page 39

serve 103:13	<b>showed</b> 107:21	size 78:3	<b>solve</b> 100:2
servers 57:4	showed 107.21	skeptics 59:14	somebody 11:3
service 13:9	116:24	slade 3:23	12:18,18,21,23
116:22	shut 30:23 49:1	23:19,21,21,24	13:14 14:5,16
services 57:4	101:17	24:4,8,12,14	19:23 21:21
serving 79:14	sidelines 25:16	109:1 112:16	25:9,19 26:2
101:2	signature	117:10	27:8,18 30:6
set 9:10 13:13	122:6	slam 77:1	30:18 32:9
19:7,8 31:4	significant	slippage 14:3	67:17 85:22
75:13 91:21	37:19 38:2	small 115:11	90:4 91:15
setting 39:17	52:24 77:4	smaller 37:16	94:7 104:6
settle 77:17	significantly	snarliest	117:6
settlement	99:18	102:22	somebody's
76:12 77:15	silent 27:7	snarling	10:18 15:24
78:1,2,3,9,15	similar 52:15	119:12,17	something's
78:22,25 79:4	95:11,13,21,22	social 8:17 9:2	25:25
101:12,19,23	similarly 20:24	10:8,18 11:17	somewhat
settlements	48:1 50:9	11:21 12:3,4	37:22
76:6 77:3 78:5	88:14 91:6	12:17,19,24	sonya 2:25
settling 77:10	100:2 106:1	13:15 14:1,7	122:3,8
78:4,19	<b>simple</b> 62:22	14:15,17,20	soon 36:25
several 40:4	simply 9:21	15:3,9,24 16:9	85:12 98:7,8
41:10 59:11	26:9 29:19	16:14,22 17:9	sorry 17:24
81:17 117:15	47:4 48:6	64:3,14,16,24	27:5 36:3
severe 41:7	55:20 64:23	65:9,16,23	sort 23:15
shareholder	92:14 93:25	66:4,13,17	32:11 40:25
75:15 81:20	94:6 100:8	68:17 113:4	sorts 31:20
shareholders	111:3,9	114:2 115:7	sought 56:18
19:23 75:5	single 96:12	sole 103:24	57:12 58:14
81:18,25 82:5	119:14	solely 56:14,15	115:14
shocks 41:8	sitting 32:4	57:22	sounded 23:16
<b>short</b> 87:17,20	situation 22:5	solicitation	source 10:17
shorthand	117:23	83:4,8	sources 9:19
49:14	six 62:9 67:16	solution 98:23	southern 1:2
shouldn't 30:1	69:7 93:25	solutions 34:1	108:9
111:1	94:2 96:7	122:20	<b>spaces</b> 102:10
	97:17		
	1	l .	1

	I	T	T
<b>speak</b> 16:19	stage 72:12	72:14,17,18,20	stepped 27:20
23:3 25:25	110:17,23	73:5,8,12,16	stepping 93:20
29:10 30:21	stake 43:8	statements 8:1	steps 27:18
32:1 114:13	stale 66:6	8:12 11:4	93:23
speaking 29:13	<b>stand</b> 18:24	41:20 42:4	stirred 28:4
38:8 82:10	33:4	58:11 64:10	stock 99:13,16
speaks 33:25	standard 19:21	68:16	99:17,20,23
special 3:11	55:25 57:2	states 1:1,11	106:16
5:9 35:7 76:17	73:4 90:1	4:1,17 5:1,2	stockton 5:15
76:19,22 77:1	standards 57:9	21:1 23:2,15	<b>stop</b> 24:5 31:9
78:9 80:19	58:5	32:2 49:16	31:13 48:6,24
81:10	standing 96:14	54:15 57:21	50:4,10 56:1
species 93:15	108:17	61:24 62:2,7	92:13 115:7
specific 16:18	start 8:5 18:2	62:17,18 70:1	stopped 20:16
26:8 48:3 49:9	56:5	75:21 76:7	38:13 50:13
49:23 52:19	started 13:3	82:8,10 84:22	87:16 89:3
54:7	111:4	86:13 87:7,9	90:24
specifically	state 22:11	91:8 95:20	stopping 93:19
39:13 49:5	45:10 53:15	96:1,20 97:22	storage 57:6
74:8 87:10	54:3,15,15	98:1,4,11,16	store 67:24
93:16	71:25 72:19,21	98:21	stored 57:3
specified 19:17	82:16 85:6,10	stating 76:8	<b>stores</b> 112:9
89:22 105:18	85:21 95:17,20	statue 87:7	strayed 37:22
specify 112:6	95:23 96:10,11	statute 51:12	street 4:11 5:3
spelling 37:2	96:14 97:5	51:19 85:21	<b>strict</b> 36:16
spent 94:2	98:9 99:4	statutory 86:18	61:17
<b>spoke</b> 101:18	<b>stated</b> 45:13	92:25 93:9	strictly 37:23
spoken 31:3	52:22 53:8	stay 34:12,13	60:23 75:9
33:5	71:3 82:23	34:14,18	<b>strong</b> 78:18
springs 17:20	83:2 107:10	104:12 108:13	78:20
st 4:18	statement 38:7	108:18,21	structure 80:7
staff 45:17,20	49:3,4 52:18	109:14,18	<b>stuff</b> 13:17
45:25 46:2,9	53:8,19,24,25	111:24 117:16	stupid 19:24
51:3 53:18	54:5 55:7,21	117:24	subject 21:22
120:8	56:2,9,10,17	step 14:3,24	22:4,12 36:16
staff's 46:5	57:14 70:2,3,5	67:12	40:4,7,9 41:7
	70:25 72:1,4		45:20,23 52:23
	I .	1 0 1 4	1

69:21 76:23	suggested	109:17 111:6	takes 13:25
80:8 81:4	11:18 12:1	112:3 118:22	87:10 117:22
94:24 107:12	44:3,8 54:21	surprised	talk 115:8
submission	61:3,12 62:21	111:12,15	talking 16:24
44:15 100:9	64:18 100:19	susheel 3:15	29:8,8 115:5
submissions	114:24	35:6	117:15
38:22 92:10	suggesting	suspect 108:16	targeted 10:24
120:10	43:25 58:22	sweep 98:14	tax 38:20,20,23
<b>submit</b> 66:17	suggestion	sweeping 80:21	38:23 105:21
submitted	25:22 27:7	sworn 57:14,16	105:22
36:22 59:13	52:8 94:5 95:2	sympathize	technical 12:9
subpoena	106:10	78:22	technically
53:19 54:2	suggests 54:16	system 15:20	96:20
substance	suite 122:22	67:10	technology
24:25	sullivan 3:10	t	9:19 10:12
substantial	superfluous	t 122:1,1	tell 14:8 21:23
56:22 107:17	107:15	tailored 80:25	26:1,6 29:25
substantive	supervised	take 22:25	30:20 47:14,16
55:9,10	83:16,19	25:23 33:18	51:2 67:16
successor	supplemental	35:3 43:21	68:4,23 87:5
49:19	92:10 93:13	44:6 46:1 53:3	telling 14:18
<b>sudden</b> 41:12	support 42:24	59:25 62:16,23	15:17 27:10
suddenly 85:18	51:4 52:1	69:10 82:19	tells 21:21 24:2
sue 19:23	59:19 78:9	85:25 87:18	temporal 28:24
<b>sued</b> 90:3	supported	94:1 97:12	ten 33:13
suffered 81:22	66:19 114:11	110:25 114:5,9	tend 37:16
82:5,7	supports 72:24	114:21,22	tentatively
sufficient	101:24	116:13,24	64:7 84:24
52:17 70:14	supposed	taken 20:12	term 32:8
71:10 72:2,18	21:10 45:3	29:12 39:21	50:25 65:21
suggest 17:11	46:14	45:19,23 50:4	79:12 81:9
26:24 30:18	supposedly	55:23 72:6	108:24
33:15,16,21	54:25 113:14	73:11 81:22	termination
40:22 45:2,6	sure 18:23 25:4	82:18 85:16	36:18
52:13 55:20	35:8 41:19	87:7 90:19	terms 15:22
73:25 80:18	42:14 58:18	95:3 103:5	16:14 19:4
107:19	73:5 95:10	73.3 103.3	21:2 32:6,7
	Varitant I ac		

[terms - time] Page 42

49:12 60:11,12	thanks 68:7	thing 13:14	106:7,10
63:17 72:3,4,7	120:8	23:19 93:25	110:15,23
72:24 75:6	that's 10:23	96:4 99:24	112:10,16
77:24 81:8	12:13 14:25	things 19:3	113:23 114:1,3
84:19 91:10	16:1,1,2 19:21	21:9 30:16	115:18 116:4,6
98:1 101:23	22:12 23:14	33:14 35:9,16	thinking 51:3
105:10 108:2	24:8,22 26:19	39:9 41:5	thinks 29:23
testified 58:12	32:3,10,15,24	43:11 63:22	47:23 48:5
71:14 100:24	66:21 67:1,23	83:21,23 89:9	72:12 87:14
101:2,14,17	68:1,6,13 90:1	97:17 106:3	108:5
testimony	94:19,22	107:23 114:20	third 10:12,19
57:12 68:21	108:16 109:1,6	117:15	11:23 13:9
71:22 77:23	110:14 111:9	think 9:6,9,18	15:21 16:6
78:1,3	112:3,10,15,19	13:5 15:8,15	19:16 57:7
texas 18:24	113:22 115:5	16:18,21 21:7	63:3 75:24,25
22:11 54:15	116:24 119:21	21:17 22:5,6	76:3 79:23
71:25 72:5,11	theories 48:7	22:11,23 23:4	89:21 91:21
72:19,21,23	<b>theory</b> 79:23	23:8,12,14,14	119:10
73:7,14,22	83:16	24:24 25:6,8	thought 48:1
74:2,8 95:20	therese 4:14	25:21,25 27:15	60:7 65:5
96:11,13	36:3	27:16,22 28:9	104:15 119:25
thank 7:16	there's 9:5,9	29:2,3,12,14	thousand 69:3
17:14 22:14	10:1,1,2,24	30:6,13,17	thousands 28:2
24:14 29:11	12:8 21:13	32:1,8,10,13	28:2 95:9
31:15 34:8,15	22:23 24:1,3,5	32:15 34:2,14	three 9:18
35:24 36:10	25:17 26:16	35:1,3 39:16	24:17 41:9,10
37:13 65:4	30:23 31:21	44:10,16 47:6	62:4,19,25
66:21 68:9	50:7,19 64:13	50:19 51:9	76:22 77:7
69:14,20	69:12 111:7	55:3 61:13	78:6 97:3,7,14
109:10,11,21	113:7,8,9,10	66:22 67:20	throat 59:25
110:2 111:14	114:2 116:11	69:21 70:5	throw 10:23
114:13 115:20	118:5	71:10 74:2,5	110:21
115:21,23	they're 15:8	81:13 86:5	thursday 37:7
117:8,10 118:9	21:18 26:22,23	88:23 91:17	<b>time</b> 10:7
119:6,7,20,24	27:12 51:18	92:1 93:17	11:22 13:4
120:1,3,8,10	86:1	95:1,6 97:5,9	14:9 21:20,21
		102:22 103:4	21:23,25 33:6

[time - trustee] Page 43

	T		
35:3 50:3	<b>told</b> 17:9 33:10	88:12 90:3,5	translate
56:12 58:19	45:17,20 49:9	90:13,24 92:16	102:19
60:16,17,20	50:10 94:23	93:21,24 109:5	treasury 65:14
61:7 64:4,8,23	116:17	transactions	treat 7:18
65:2,5 66:8,22	tomorrow	19:21 20:2,6	37:16 106:11
67:23 72:22	33:19 69:19	21:1 29:21	treated 42:5
73:18,20 83:7	93:22 108:21	47:7 48:18	80:10 106:25
85:7 89:11	tons 10:22,22	51:16 52:7	treatment
95:14 96:5	took 13:4	53:2,5,9,13	61:22 95:19
99:1,9 110:8	31:13 49:3	80:9,13 82:12	97:7,10,21
115:24 117:8	81:21 85:18	82:17 83:20	98:4,13 100:13
117:22,24	touch 117:4,5,6	86:24 87:4,24	100:15 102:15
120:3	towards 23:9	88:8,15,20	103:8 104:1
times 37:21	23:24 78:19	89:2,8,25 90:8	106:8
59:11 81:17	townsend 5:15	91:9 92:13	trevino 118:18
<b>timing</b> 36:17	7:11	93:8,10,16	<b>tried</b> 13:2
tired 118:10	tracy 5:22	transcribed	22:13 37:19
119:11	118:14	2:25	97:17 119:11
<b>today</b> 9:24	trade 75:20	transcript	trigger 36:18
33:1 36:24	traded 48:4	36:21 37:2	trouble 9:3
37:10 81:14	105:8,24 106:1	122:4	true 58:17,18
88:9,15,19	trades 67:3	transfer 63:4,6	119:21 122:4
94:6 108:11	trading 39:7	63:12,24 64:2	truly 88:14
118:19,22	39:20 40:19	64:9,11,14,16	trust 56:15
together 23:11	48:6 50:5	65:19 66:17,18	60:23 61:17
79:9	transaction 8:3	68:15,17 104:7	70:12
<b>toggle</b> 50:12,19	9:11 10:17,25	112:12	trusted 59:20
71:2,8,17	12:11,14 15:2	transferred	trustee 4:2
92:20	16:9 20:16	56:11 57:1	28:12,12,19
<b>token</b> 44:1	25:19 30:10	60:17 61:15	32:23 34:13
45:18 46:16	31:23 32:5	63:9 68:12,13	54:15 70:1
47:22 48:4,7	36:15,20 43:3	70:7,11,22	75:22 76:7
49:23 50:2,5	55:13 56:21	112:2	82:8 84:23
52:2 105:5,7,9	59:8,23 60:6,8	transferring	103:22 109:15
106:24	63:12 65:10	7:25	109:23 110:4,5
tokyo 57:4	67:23 70:20	transfers 7:19	110:7,12
	77:12 80:14		119:11

truth 74:12	34:13 42:17	unclear 41:4	12:7 13:11
<b>try</b> 14:5 23:11	60:10,15,17,18	42:13	14:10 15:14,18
23:12 31:9	60:20,25 61:2	unconvincing	28:14,22 76:10
48:8 104:18	61:12 62:2,10	17:10	84:23
105:19 107:25	62:11,15,25	undeliverable	understood
108:2 115:10	63:5,11,13,14	104:19	36:7,9 108:22
117:18	63:16,20,23	<b>under</b> 19:14	119:25
<b>trying</b> 15:10	64:5,17,18,20	22:3,7 25:20	undertaking
17:7 27:6	65:7,19,23	26:23 37:18	93:15
30:22 32:1	66:7,14 68:14	49:20 50:12	<b>undo</b> 77:11
88:25 92:12	69:18 70:7,9	58:19 62:1,17	unenviable
117:14,17	70:20,21 71:1	63:8 66:1,18	43:2
turn 29:10	71:11 72:3,24	67:9 71:1,2,2	unequal
43:11 113:20	74:25 85:9	71:20 73:25	100:13
turned 58:11	86:16,22 87:8	77:24 87:22	unfair 95:18
tweaks 24:24	95:22 97:18,25	89:19 96:6	96:20
32:18 81:12	103:22 108:9	97:1 99:11	unfairly 96:18
two 7:25 13:15	108:24 109:15	103:9 105:10	96:25 105:5
17:7 28:14	112:1,13 114:8	113:10,11,14	unfortunately
30:7 33:13	116:5,12,16,22	underlie 71:18	37:24
43:16 53:18	117:14	understand	unintentionally
64:7,15 65:11	<b>u.s.'s</b> 87:16	11:19 13:18	36:18
68:14 76:15	109:4	14:19 15:10	unit 20:15
77:6 78:19	ucc 119:13	17:1,7 34:17	90:23
95:16 109:5	ultimate 107:4	36:11 45:14	<b>united</b> 1:1,11
110:24 111:20	107:6	48:11 59:13	4:1 5:1,2 21:1
113:17 115:24	ultimately	62:5 63:8	23:15 32:2
116:19	73:19 101:20	64:22 67:14,19	54:15 70:1
<b>type</b> 15:25	unable 31:6	78:16 79:21	75:21 76:7
<b>types</b> 40:18	52:9	91:19 102:18	82:8 84:22
80:21	uncertain 40:2	103:18 106:22	91:8
typical 31:18	40:15	107:25 115:2	<b>units</b> 53:10
91:15	uncertainties	115:13	unknowable
u	52:24	understanda	40:17
<b>u.s.</b> 1:23 4:2	uncertainty	115:18	unknowingly
22:17 28:12,12	27:24 40:12	understanding	92:24
28:19 32:23		9:4 11:13,20	
20.17 32.23			

unknown 9:15	uploads 65:18	variety 21:17	violative 51:19
79:19	116:20	various 18:22	virginia 57:4
unlicensed	urquhart 3:10	18:24 55:20	virtually 40:17
44:7	use 12:4 32:8	56:18 57:5,7	voice 31:6
unlock 31:8	72:3,4,7,24	58:5 71:3	<b>voices</b> 111:16
unnecessary	used 29:13	76:23	volatile 9:25
107:16	41:23 50:25	vary 99:8	volition 22:3
unreasonable	users 116:2,13	veritext 122:20	volumes 39:7
86:6 90:4	uses 10:12	vermont 95:23	voluntary 75:9
unregistered	using 50:15	version 34:11	<b>vote</b> 66:20
44:7 52:3	usually 58:20	82:20 119:23	75:11
unsecured	58:21	vgx 30:8 45:18	<b>voted</b> 96:23
78:10,11 79:8	utterly 31:14	46:15 47:22	97:4 113:16
100:21 101:4	v	50:2,7 87:15	votes 83:4
101:11 110:5	v 78:11 83:24	105:5,5,7,9,12	101:21
unspecified	vague 43:25	105:12,16,17	<b>voting</b> 101:21
44:1 87:15	79:25	105:24 106:6,7	113:13 114:12
unsupported	vaguely 51:21	106:13,22,24	voyager 1:7
21:4,5 52:20	87:14	vgx's 49:23	7:4 9:16 10:14
61:23 62:8,14	vagueness	view 28:18	11:15 12:16
62:20 91:12,13	44:15	43:17 59:14	13:8,14 14:13
97:16 99:7	valuable 9:22	87:25	16:8 18:8,9,10
100:15	10:10,15 12:13	views 40:25	36:13 37:12
untethered	value 9:14,18	46:2,4	39:25 41:6,10
81:3	10:17 15:1,21	vigorously	52:2 53:14,20
unusual 37:14	65:10,21 66:15	78:20	53:21,22 60:19
39:23 95:5	66:19 67:23	violate 20:13	61:16 63:5,5
unusually	99:9,21 105:9	24:4,6 30:2	63:15 77:12
37:10	105:12,14,17	51:11 87:6	79:12 92:19
unwilling 31:6	106:17,18	90:21 108:24	98:17 101:15
unwillingness	107:1	violated 91:6	101:17 102:16
93:6	values 100:12	violates 85:10	104:10 113:9
unwittingly	105:16 106:3	violating 44:20	116:1,13
92:25	106:12,20,20	44:21	voyager's 12:9
uploaded 8:1,9	106:20,21	violation 30:5	63:24 65:24
11:4 64:10	vanderbilt	83:7 106:9	81:19,24 104:8
68:16	5:10		

[vtx - working] Page 46

vtx 44:1	warrants 81:6	we'll 35:21,22	wished 97:12
W	warren 75:23	42:7 119:4	wishes 64:21
	washington	we're 7:2 10:1	88:14
wait 8:7 29:10	4:12,19	24:14 26:8	withdraw
32:25 41:18	wasn't 22:2	31:20 59:24	56:23 58:1
62:9 96:5	118:22	88:22,25 115:5	61:1 115:25
97:16	watkins 3:3	117:21,22	116:2,9,12
waive 18:9	65:6 109:4	119:11	withdrawal
waived 18:8	111:25 114:8	we've 10:22	115:25 116:11
116:1,13	116:16	14:12 22:20	116:20,24
<b>waiver</b> 34:12 34:13	way 11:18 14:5	whatsoever	withdrawals
wallet 57:3	20:14 22:24	85:17,17 95:12	61:8
want 12:21	23:8 29:18	what's 14:21	withdrawn
14:7 15:11	35:8,20 38:15	31:9 32:11	74:5
16:4 17:2,6	41:23,23 42:9	102:18	witnesses
25:18 26:1	51:18 55:8	whoever's 29:8	58:12
28:6 32:18	69:4,15 90:23	wholesale	woman 22:10
33:10,17,18	92:20 96:21	63:12	33:24
35:25 37:13	98:5 99:18,20	wholly 86:6	won't 21:16
62:15 67:14,22	103:8 105:8	who's 29:8	69:17 80:1
67:24,25 81:16	110:11 115:15	<b>who've</b> 7:13	103:11 110:3
97:18,21	web 57:3	21:12	word 29:13
111:23 113:7	website 116:5	wider 40:23	36:23
115:2,3,10	116:8,22,23	wiles 1:22	wording 22:13
119:8 120:3	week 7:25	willful 31:22	22:14
wanted 11:5	13:15 30:22	80:17 84:4	wordsmithing
24:18 28:5,14	64:7,15 68:14	91:16	35:22 89:16,17
32:25 35:7,9	85:3 88:24	winddown	work 24:9
35:10 45:4,12	113:17	76:9 103:24	37:14 74:22
61:8 97:19	weeks 93:25	119:11	97:17 100:23
108:15 111:19	94:2	wings 26:4	100:25 102:2,7
114:25 119:17	welcome 67:22	wipe 66:24	103:6 105:22
wanting 35:8	68:1	67:7	107:24 108:2
wants 9:2	weren't 28:23	<b>wisdom</b> 39:13	118:4,7
12:18 14:16	119:12	59:2	working 34:21
24:22 68:19	we'd 22:24	wish 31:2	35:4
69:5 88:12	33:14	63:20	
Varitant Lagal Salutions			

[works - zero] Page 47

works 15:16	<b>yep</b> 23:23	
<b>world</b> 102:2,6	32:15	
102:19 114:21	yesterday	
worried 28:25	16:25 23:3	
58:7 59:15	29:3,6 37:8	
<b>worries</b> 106:22	49:4,7 80:23	
worrisome	80:24 81:14	
41:15	85:13,14,22	
<b>worth</b> 37:9	99:5 103:10	
76:20 78:21	104:14 106:10	
wouldn't	110:22	
110:21 115:3	york 1:2,13 3:6	
117:25	3:13,20 4:4 5:4	
would've 31:3	5:11,18 54:16	
write 8:8	95:17,19,25	
writing 22:24	96:4,5,6,8,10	
written 22:23	96:14,18,19	
28:20 31:19	98:24 99:2,4	
43:15,25 73:23	104:5,8,12	
74:6	108:10	
wrong 44:25	yorker 96:12	
45:1 55:20	you'd 14:14	
wrongdoing	35:20	
43:4,5	you're 12:3,22	
wrongful 88:9	13:12 15:16	
wrote 34:3	16:2,22 22:1	
X	25:15 29:9	
x 1:4,10 121:1	113:1 118:5	
	you've 11:18	
<u>y</u>	12:1 17:9 28:4	
yeah 9:8 24:3	35:22 119:13	
32:12 112:16	Z	
112:20	zero 42:23	
year 13:1 41:8	2010 12.23	
years 40:4,14		
95:10		
	Varitant I ad	